THE THEOLOGICAL REVIEW:

A JOURNAL

OF

RELIGIOUS THOUGHT AND LIFE.

"Our fathers worshiped in this mountain; and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship." * * *

"The hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. * * * But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship Him. God is a Spirit: and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." (John iv. 20, 21, 23, 24.)

VOL. VIII. Nos. XXXII.—XXXV.

LONDON:

WILLIAMS & NORGATE, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN,

AND AT 20, SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH.

MANCHESTER: JOHNSON & RAWSON, 89, MARKET STREET.

1871.

THE

THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

No. XXXII.—January, 1871.

I.—THE RELATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT MESSIAH TO HIS JEWISH PROTOTYPE.—III.

Having examined the person and character of the Jewish Messiah, we proceed to consider whether Jesus of Nazareth corresponded to the prototype. This will bring up the question respecting the application of passages in the Old Testament to Jesus in the New. Are the quotations properly made? Is the sense they give to the Old Testament the true one? Here the hypothesis of a double sense presents itself. In treating these topics we shall pursue the following order, and inquire,

1. Is the sense of Scripture one, or may it be twofold?

2. What is meant by the principle of *accommodation* in explaining quotations from the Old Testament in the New?

3. We shall then classify citations and examine them in detail; and, finally,

4. Investigate the mode in which Jesus fulfilled Messianic prophecies; shewing the fallacy of Collins's argument, as well as that of the Jews, against Christianity; the weakness of the answer to Collins given by Bishop Chandler and others; with a correct statement of the case.

1. The sense of Scripture is that which the writers intended when they used certain words to convey to the reader such ideas as were in their minds: and the business of an interpreter is to seek out and set forth the ideas so expressed. What did an author mean to communicate, what ideas did he purpose to excite in the mind of the reader? is the primary question with which an interpreter has to do. After its solution he has only to convey to others in perspicuous language the sense ascertained.

As the Bible was meant to be understood by all, we sup-

3429

pose that the words of it have but one sense, called the literal, natural, or grammatico-historical. It matters not whether the language be literal or tropical; the sense is everywhere one. This is a fundamental principle in hermeneutics. We are aware that a spiritual or mystical sense has been often advocated in addition to the primary or historical one; that the Jews began at an early period to adopt that method of explaining their Scriptures, and that the fathers followed their example; but the arbitrary procedure it involves, the ambiguity it introduces, and the result assuredly brought about, in which the true meaning of the Bible becomes a riddle, and imagination has full play for making the book utter anything that may seem plausible, prompt its rejection. Nothing settled or secure in sacred hermeneutics can be reached while a departure from the one sense intended by the original writer is allowed, and various meanings, equally authorized, equally true, are discovered in his words.

Those who advocate a double sense have something, however, to say in its favour. In addition to the authority of the Jews and Christian fathers, they refer to the typical character of the Old Testament as indicating the propriety of a twofold sense, in such parts at least as shadow forth future events. They can also point to the nature of prophecy, and the quotations in the New Testament of prophetical passages. The extreme difficulty of making citations agree with their originals leads many to adopt a twofold sense, the literal and the spiritual. It is argued that the prophets did not always understand the meaning of what they uttered, or at least its full meaning; that the Spirit from whom they received their communications may have had a higher end in view than any they could see; and that they were unconscious instruments in using language capable of an ulterior application. Although they attached their own sense to the words employed, the Spirit guided them all the while to the use of that very language because it would bear a ὑπόνοια, *a hidden meaning*, to be realized thereafter. In this manner some scholars reason, virtually dividing two senses among the writer and the Holy Spirit. The tendency of such doctrine is to involve the interpretation of Scripture in mysticism and hopeless uncertainty. The so-called spiritual sense is

not *derived from* but is itself the literal. The two are identical. It is therefore incorrect to speak of the one being the source of the other, or of the spiritual *underlying* the literal, or of spiritual interpretation being *based on* the literal. "The completeness of Scripture" does not require perverse methods of ascertaining the sense of the various books contained in the canon.*

The prophetic parts of the Old Testament are the main argument on which the advocates of a double sense rely in connection with citations of them in the New Testament. The whole subject of quotations is an intricate one, as the volumes written upon it attest. Prophecies, however, form no exception to the hermeneutical canon already enunciated. Whether they relate to the Messiah and his kingdom, or to other persons and events, they have a single sense.

It is not our present purpose to consider the external forms or sources of all the quotations. We have done that already.† Neither shall we examine every single one. Rather do we intend to discuss the most prominent and important, chiefly such as refer to the person, life and kingdom of Jesus Christ, or to persons and events necessarily connected with him. By this means we shall include in our essay all passages cited from the Old Testament in fulfilment of prophecies or in proof of doctrines; and they are the most important.

2. Before directly entering on the subject, it may be desirable to explain the term *accommodation*, which is usually employed by those who examine quotations.

The word *οἰκονομία*, in Latin *dispensatio*, or economy as we are obliged to say in English, was applied to the quotation of passages from the Old Testament in proof of a thing to which they have no proper reference. Thus when Celsus objected that many passages of the Old Testament were applied to Christ in the New, which related to other sub-

---

* "Non existimarem esse duos sensus, verum unum tantum loci proprium, quia unum et verum convertuntur; alium autem non esse proprie sensum, sed tantum comparationem dictorum aut factorum, per analogiam; quæ quidem ad sensum literalem et grammaticum pertinebit, sed non tollet unitatem sensus præcipui, ex quo desumetur analogia." Riveti Isagoge ad Scripturam Sacram, p. 218.

† See "The Text of the Old Testament considered," Vol. II. of Horne's Introduction, 1859 (second edition).

jects, Origen replied that they were employed *by economy*. Most of the Greek fathers used the term so introduced and the principle involved in it. The Latin fathers, translating it by *dispensatio*, advocated the same thing. Such interpretation Michaelis bluntly stigmatizes as a logical finesse or pious fraud, though it is the *accommodation*-principle which many advocate.

It is necessary, however, to look at the meaning of *accommodation* more closely, because the word has been used loosely and not always in the same sense. Some apply it to cases in which the apostles and evangelists referred numerous passages in the Old Testament, which were never designed to bear such relation, to Christ and his kingdom, from accommodation to the prejudices of the Jews in their day, who were accustomed to explain them Messianically. So Semler expresses himself. Others use it of the same class of quotations, believing that the interpretations of apostles and evangelists were their real opinions with respect to the meaning of the Hebrew Scriptures; and that they expounded according to their own conviction when they adopted the principle in question. The difference between the two acceptations of the word is important. In the one, the writers adapted a passage to their purpose by giving it a meaning which they supposed it was not intended to bear. In the other, they adapted a passage to their purpose by attaching to it a sense which, though not obvious or natural, it was really meant to have, either as the sole sense, or as a spiritual one in addition to the primary. The latter is improperly termed accommodation, at least from the point of view which the New Testament writers themselves took. From ours it may be so styled. Others employ the word to denote the application of terms in the Old Testament to another occasion where they are equally suitable, as an illustrative parallel. So Sykes understands it, followed by Palfrey, who calls it a device of rhetoric, because words used by an ancient writer in an entirely different application are simply adopted as applicable to other circumstances. The phrase should not have been taken in this sense. The proper use of it is the first, when an apostle or evangelist adapts a passage from the Old Testament to an occasion for which he is conscious it was not designed, giving it a sense different from

that of the original author, alien to the context, and incorrect. Out of deference to custom, we shall use it in the second sense. The epithet *rhetorical* prefixed will prevent the confusion of the second and third senses.

The following observations and questions are suggested by the principle of accommodation:

(*a.*) No theory of inspiration relative to the New Testament writers should regulate the discussion of this subject; rather should accommodation inductively examined be allowed to determine the kind of inspiration they possessed. Their assumed infallibility will necessarily do away with the first and second senses of accommodation.

(*b.*) If there be instances of accommodation in the first sense, it is difficult to distinguish between them and those bearing the second. That the latter are numerous admits of no doubt. In either case, the hermeneutical result is the same to us, i.e. we are not bound to adopt forced or mistaken interpretations, though made by the New Testament writers themselves.

(*c.*) It is easy to see why the third class may be unduly enlarged. Its extension to passages introduced by the strong expression, *this was done that it might be fulfilled*, &c., enables the expositor to deny the premiss set forth by Collins, viz., that Christianity is grounded on typical or allegorical proofs from the Old Testament which are invalid.* Sykes supposes all the citations made out of the Old Testament in the New to be mere rhetorical accommodation, except about six.† If this be so, a conclusion hostile to Christianity cannot be drawn from them.

(*d.*) Is Michaelis right in concluding from the admission of accommodation in the first sense, that "the Deity speaking in the New Testament misunderstood the meaning of the Old"? By the Deity speaking in the New Testament he seems to understand Jesus Christ. Presuming this to be his opinion, it opens up a wide field of discussion. We shall answer the question afterwards, either expressly or by implication.

(*e.*) Is the same critic correct in believing, supposing it

---

* Discourse of the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion, Part i. See vii. and viii.

† Essay upon the Truth of the Christian Religion, chapters xiii.—xvi.

inconceivable to sound reason, that persons commissioned by the Deity to preach the truth to mankind should have recourse to accommodation in the first sense?

(*f.*) Dr. H. Owen observes, that the applications which evangelists have made of prophecies to Christ must necessarily be just because *they* have so applied them. "For if the same Spirit that dictated the prophecies in the Old Testament dictated also their interpretations in the New, he surely best knew his own mind, and could best ascertain to whom or to what they were meant to be ultimately referred." How should this statement be judged? Is it not based on an assumed theory of inspiration which is wholly untenable?

(*g.*) When Bishop Butler writes: "To say that the Scriptures and the things contained in them can have no other or farther meaning than those persons thought or had who first recited or wrote them, is evidently saying that those persons were the original, proper and sole authors of those books, i. e. *they are not inspired,*" the concluding words are incorrect. Inspiration does not clash with the belief that the Scriptures were written by human authors who had a meaning in their words. The Spirit of God influenced thought in accordance with psychology.

We object also to the Bishop's statement, that "events corresponding to prophecies interpreted in a different meaning from that in which the prophets are supposed to have understood them; this affords, in a manner, the same proof that this different sense was originally intended, as it would have afforded, if the prophets had not understood their predictions in the sense it is supposed they did; because there is no presumption of their sense of them being the whole sense of them." Every presumption favours the idea that the prophets attached a sense to the words they uttered. In cannot be shewn that they did not understand what they wrote. Their own meaning is the whole meaning; and no correspondence of events to their prophecies which disagrees with that meaning can be the intended fulfilment. The true sense of prophecy must be determined by the language in which it is expressed, not by corresponding events which are *supposed* to fulfil it, because the correspondence may be accidental, not designed.

(*h.*) The quotations which Christ makes from the Old

Testament should be examined by themselves, instead of being thrown along with those of apostles and evangelists, as they are by Collins, and even by friends to Christianity. Tholuck has properly separated them.

3. The following classification of quotations may suffice for our purpose:

(*a.*) Those introduced by the formula, *all this was done that it might be fulfilled*, or, *that it might be fulfilled which was spoken*, &c., *that the Scripture* (or *Scriptures*) *might be fulfilled, that the word might be fulfilled* (Matt. i. 22, ii. 15, ii. 23, iv. 14, viii. 17, xii. 17, xiii. 35, xxi. 4, xxvi. 56; Mark xiv. 49; John xii. 38, xiii. 18, xv. 25, xvii. 12, xviii. 9, xix. 24, 28, 36). In all these cases the conjunctions ἵνα and ὅπως (in order that) are used.

(*b.*) Quotations with the formula, *then was fulfilled that which was spoken, the Scripture is fulfilled* (Matt. ii. 17, xxvii. 9; Luke iv. 21).

(*c.*) Citations or applications of Scripture made by Christ (Matt. xiii. 14, 15, xv. 7—9, xxi. 42, xxii. 43, xxiv. 15, xxvi. 24, 31, 54; Mark ix. 12, 13, xiv. 49; Luke iv. 18—21, xxii. 37, xxiv. 27, 44; John xvii. 12).

(*d.*) Pauline quotations.

(*e.*) Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

(Matt. i. 22, 23.)

We have already seen that the virgin, or rather young woman, in Isaiah vii. 14, was living when the words of the prophet were spoken, and was either his betrothed or his wife. If so, the passage cannot refer to the mother of Jesus; nor the son, with a symbolical name, to her child. It is applied to a case quite different from that to which they relate.

Is this a legitimate rhetorical device on the part of the evangelist? Does he merely mean that words used by the ancient prophet in an entirely different manner might be adopted as applicable to certain circumstances of the birth of Jesus? Are we to suppose him embellishing his description by the remark, "This might be well described by language employed on a different occasion by the old prophet"? So some affirm, arguing that the word rendered *fulfil* often means no more than to *verify* or *make good;* and that it is so used for illustration in Greek, Latin, Syriac

and Jewish authors. Classical writers, however, are hardly to the purpose in such a question, since the evangelists were Hebrews. A few cases in which the verb *fulfil* means no more than the happening of a similar event or an agreement in particular circumstances of later with former things, *have* been collected. But no writer has succeeded in shewing that a quotation introduced by the strong expression, "this was done that it might be fulfilled," means no more than the happening of a like event. For the conjunction *that* is *telic* (in order that), denoting purpose or design; the *ecbatic* sense (so that), which Glass and Tittmann advocate, being an imaginary one.* The conjunction is an expression of Hebrew teleology, which represents every event as designed and disposed by God, so that consequences and causes are interchanged. All the parallels adduced by Palfrey from Sykes, Wetstein, Surenhusius and others, are insufficient. The evangelist must have supposed that the passage in Isaiah had a reference to the event recorded in the Gospel. There is more than parity of circumstances. He quotes it as proof rather than illustration. The sense he attaches to Isaiah's prophecy is a typical one, believing it to be the divine purpose that the one event should foreshadow the other. This typical sense may be termed allegorical or mystic; it is not the historical one which the prophet meant. The passage is an instance of real accommodation.

(ii. 15.)

The prophecy of Hosea, to which these words refer, concerns the people of Israel in their exodus from Egypt, which the evangelist accommodates to the return of Jesus in his childhood from Egypt to Palestine, by adopting a typical sense. Leaving the literal entirely out of view, he regards the spiritual sense as divinely intended. The introductory words forbid the assumption that the passage is a mere parallel. A rhetorical device fails to do justice to the formula.

(ii. 23.)

Here the writer seems to apply the Messianic word in

---

* See Winer's Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms, 7th ed., by Lünemann, p. 426, &c.

Isaiah (xi. 1), translated "branch," to the name of Nazareth. A mystic sense is attributed to the original, as well as a literal. Thus there is an accommodation of the Old Testament to an event different from any that Isaiah meant; a play on the Hebrew word; a Jewish Midrash; but still referred to divine arrangement.

(iv. 14, 15.)

The prophet from whom these words are taken promises deliverance to Northern Galilee from the disasters brought upon it by the Assyrians. The evangelist sees the fulfilment of the prophecy in the spiritual salvation of the gospel. He abandons the historical sense, and adopts a typical or mystical one. This is accommodation. It is wrong to say with Palfrey, "Matthew had no idea of representing the residence of Jesus at Capernaum as the accomplishment of a prediction."

(viii. 17.)

The original Hebrew of Isaiah from whom this quotation is taken, means, "he bore our diseases and carried our pains," i.e. afflicted Israel took our *sins* upon himself, and suffered their punishment. The evangelist takes it in another sense, understanding the removal of physical diseases and sufferings. This is a simple accommodation of the passage. Yet it is cited as the fulfilment of a prophecy or of a divine purpose, as we see from the introductory formula.

(xii. 17—21.)

The servant in the original Hebrew is Israel, not the Messiah. The evangelist refers the title to Christ, and otherwise applies part of the passage to his office, part to his temporary forbearance and modesty. He takes the words to be a prophecy fulfilled in Jesus, which is not their literal but typical sense.

(xiii. 35.)

The original is in Psalm lxxviii. 2, the writer of which is called a prophet, i.e. an inspired poet and teacher. The psalm has nothing of the nature of prediction; it is simply a historical poem, containing no parable. Here, however, the evangelist takes it as a prophecy divinely meant to foreshadow Christ's teachings. Departing from the his-

torical sense, he finds a spiritual one in the words cited. This is another instance of accommodation.

(xxi. 4, 5.)

The passage here given is from Zechariah (ix. 9), but the introductory words seem to be from Isaiah lxii. 11. There is little doubt that the evangelist regarded the prophecy as fulfilled in Jesus's riding on a colt into Jerusalem, and quotes it as a proof of his Messianic mission. The historical sense is not that which is given by the evangelist. The prophet paints his ideal king in the simple pageantry of peace. His language is metaphorical and poetic. Matthew makes it represent or predict a literal fact. His accommodation of the passage involves a typical or spiritual sense.

(xxvi. 56.)

The fate of Jesus in its general character of suffering corresponded with prophetic forebodings. So Matthew says here. It was in the design of God that Christ should suffer. His voluntary self-sacrifice accomplished the divine purposes to which the ideal aspirations of prophets tended. Not that the ancient seers predicted a suffering Messiah; but that Jesus, conscious of his destiny, saw that the way to the purification of humanity lay through his death.

(John xii. 37, 38.)

Here the evangelist applies the words of Isaiah, in a typical or spiritual sense, which he supposed to be divinely intended. It is an example of accommodation.

(xiii. 18.)

From Psalm xli. 9, where the unknown poet celebrates an event in his own life. The evangelist regards the theocratic sufferer as an ordained type of Christ, and applies his language to the latter.

(xv. 25.)

This quotation must be explained on the same principle as the last. The hatred shewn to pious sufferers under the Old Testament was looked upon as their predetermined fate, and therefore they were all types of Christ.

(xviii. 8, 9.)

Here the evangelist regards what Jesus had said in xvii. 12, as a prophecy applicable to the bodily deliverance of

the disciples; whereas it was spoken of their spiritual safety. He takes the words in a twofold sense.

(xix. 24.)

The quotation here is from Psalm xxii. 18, in which a theocratic sufferer sets forth his wrongs. The evangelist gives a typical sense to the passage, regarding the treatment which the psalmist received as predetermined by God—an antepast of that which Jesus should meet with, so that the Scripture was fulfilled by the latter.

(xix. 28.)

There is some difficulty in explaining this passage. The most probable interpretation connects the clause, "that the Scripture might be fulfilled," with the verb *saith*, agreeably to which Jesus makes known his thirst, with the design of fulfilling a passage of Scripture, Psalm lxix. 21. The quotation shews the pragmatism of the evangelist.

(xix. 36.)

This quotation is from Exodus xii. 46. The paschal lamb is viewed as a type of Christ; and therefore the evangelist, according to his view of Scripture pragmatism, considers what was written of the lamb as fulfilled in the forbearance of the soldiers to break the legs of Jesus.

(*b.*) Quotations with the formula, *then was fulfilled that which was spoken*, or, *the Scripture is fulfilled.*

(Matt. ii. 17.)

This quotation is from Jeremiah, who represents Rachel, ancestress of Benjamin one of the tribes composing the kingdom of Judah, weeping over the exiles as her children; for Rama belonged to Benjamin, and the way of the captives to Babylon lay by that city. Some suppose that the evangelist quotes it as a parallel: the comfortless distress of bereaved mothers at Bethlehem might be described in the language of Jeremiah speaking of Judah's desolation.* This is improbable. Matthew finds a prophecy in the words of Jeremiah, whose ultimate sense was brought out in Herod's cruel treatment of the children at Bethlehem.

(xxvii. 9.)

The evangelist citing from Zechariah made a mistake.

---

* See Kidder's Demonstration of the Messias, Part ii., p. 81, second edition.

The prophet relates that on giving up Ephraim, in the name of Jehovah, to its destruction, and receiving thirty shekels as his recompence, he cast them into the public treasury. Such is the historical sense. The evangelist alters and adapts the words to a different occasion. Giving them a typical sense, he transfers them to the spending of the traitor's reward on the potter's field.

(Luke iv. 21) will be considered under the next head.

Many think that this class of quotations exemplifies the use of the word *fulfilled* as meaning *verified* or *made good*; i.e. the language in which a former event or circumstance is narrated fitly describes a later. The verb *fulfil* thus introduces some description or statement which presents a parallel to what the writer has been saying. The explanation falls short of the truth. By employing the phraseology in question, the New Testament writer intimates his belief in the divine pre-determination of the parallel. The Old Testament fact or event was directed (so he supposes) to resemble a fact or event relating to Christ. This is not *prediction* but prefiguration. Those who agree in favour of mere parallelism, and against the idea of prediction, in the instances before us, miss the exact view. Apostles and evangelists shew by the use of the introductory formula that they had a glimpse of the Old Testament containing the New in essence. Their view of the connection between them was in harmony with that Hebrew pragmatism which, overlooking second causes and the laws of Nature, referred all that good men think, say and do, directly to God, whose sovereign purposes and never-ceasing activity are prominently adduced.

The two examples in Matthew's Gospel attest the author's dogmatic propensity. Believing that Jesus was the son of David, the Messiah foretold and promised in the Old Testament, the evangelist derives his proofs of the fact from prophetic passages. This dogmatic tendency was obviously the result of honest conviction.

(*c.*) Citations or applications of Scripture made by Christ. (Matt. xiii. 13—15.)

This is from Isaiah vi. 9, 10. Jesus uses the words of the prophet as an impressive parallel. The dulness and obduracy of his hearers resembled the stupidity of Isaiah's contemporaries.

(xv. 7—9.)

The passage is from Isaiah xxix. 13, where the prophet's contemporaries are reproved. Our Lord adopts his language, saying to those he addresses that the words are exactly applicable to them. It is an illustrative parallel.

In xxi. 13, 16, the words of the Old Testament are used as a substratum for the ideas of Jesus himself. They are simply illustrative.

(xxi. 42.)

This citation is from Psalm cxviii. 22, 23, where the writer celebrates his deliverance from an abject condition and elevation to one of conspicuous security and honour, under the figure of a stone at first rejected as unfit for use, but afterwards chosen to be the corner-support of the building. Probably Israel personified is the subject. Its application to Jesus is natural and appropriate, since it seems to be a proverbial saying. The accommodation is legitimate, not interfering with the historical sense.

(xxii. 41—45.)

The quotation is from the 110th psalm, which was not written *by* but *of* David, by a contemporary poet. Jesus adopts the current interpretation of the psalm, that it is Messianic and written by David, not necessarily signifying that he believed it correct, for it was beside his purpose at the time to speak particularly of the matter. It was enough for his present object to take the prevailing view of the psalm. His argument is that commonly called *ex concessis.* Admitting the view of his opponents relating to the psalm, he seems to put a question to the Pharisees in order to perplex and confound them. They had just failed to catch him in his words, and now he proposes an entangling question. Such is the natural interpretation of the words in this Gospel. But the parallel passage in Mark (xii. 35—37) is more correct, preserving apparently the original form of the occurrence. According to it, the argument of Jesus is directed against the general opinion that the Messiah would be a descendant of David. If David calls Messiah his Lord, how can he be his son? In this manner he opposes the view of Messiah's Davidic descent. Whether the Pharisees would be led by such means to another and higher conception of his person, viz., that he was not a political

king and ruler, is uncertain. But we can hardly believe, with Neander, that the doubt apparently cast on the Messiah's un-Davidic origin was only intended to awaken that spiritual conception. Those who insist on the expression, "David *in spirit* calls him Lord," as an evidence that Jesus really attributes the composition of the psalm to David under divine inspiration, should recollect that the precise words of Jesus may not be given here, since Luke has no more than "David says in the book of Psalms." The inscription was assumed as correct, since it was not the purpose of Jesus to examine its truth.

(xxiv. 15.)

Here Jesus, anticipating the desecration of the temple by the Roman army, applies to himself and the victory of his cause the words of Daniel, ix. 26, 27. The original refers to the desolation in Jerusalem wrought by Antiochus Epiphanes. Our Lord takes a past event and considers it repeated. What was done once to the temple will be done again. The "abomination of desolation," Daniel's phrase, is applied to the coming catastrophe. The language is an illustrative parallel, and no more. We assume that the words were really spoken by him, though the evangelist has put into his mouth many prophetic sayings of the chapter which he did not utter. The parenthesis is the evangelist's.

(xxvi. 31.)

In the original, Zechariah anticipates national calamities. The shepherd and the sheep are quite different from Jesus and his disciples. Is this a mere parallel? Does our Lord adopt language originally used of one occasion and apply it to another? We do not agree with Calvin and others in taking it for a parallel illustration and nothing more. The expression, "*for* it is written," implies more than that. Jesus gives a typical sense to the Old Testament passage, whose language relates to the prophetic order, by whom, it is here intimated, the great prophet was prefigured. The collective body of the prophets prepared for and typified the true prophet to come. They were Jehovah's representatives; so was Christ in a higher sense.

(xxvi. 53, 54.)

Jesus knew that his sufferings and death were an essen-

tial part of that instrumentality by which God influenced the minds of men in order to their salvation. The divine purpose to which the Scriptures pointed could not be fulfilled unless the object of Christ's mission were accomplished, which was only to be through his death. Thus the Old Testament is supposed to contain arrangements preparatory to the agency of Christ, in whose person and fate they found consummation.

(Mark ix. 12, 13.)

The Jews expected that the returning Elijah would induce them to believe in the Messiah, and therefore that the latter would not suffer. Jesus opposes and corrects their ideas on this head. "Elias verily cometh first and restoreth all things:" such was the opinion of the scribes, which Jesus admits for the moment, and then asks, "But how is it written of the Son of Man that he must suffer much and be rejected?" How is this consistent with that view of Elijah? "But I say unto you, that Elias is come already, and they did to him whatever they pleased, as it is written of him;" i.e. Your expectation of Elijah is erroneous; he will not prepare the way for me; the promise of his re-appearance is fulfilled in John the Baptist. The fate of John the Baptist is said to be typically represented in that of Elijah and the prophets generally. The Old Testament sets forth the prophetic principle that the pious must suffer. Thus Jesus rejects as unfounded the current expectations of the Pharisees that Elias would return before the Messiah.

(xiv. 49.)

The remarks made upon Matt. xxvi. 53, 54, explain this citation. The Scriptures and the divine purpose to which they related could not be fulfilled, unless the object of Christ's advent were accomplished, and that was to be through no other agency than his sufferings and death.

(Luke iv. 18—21.)

This is an inexact quotation from Isaiah lxi. 1, 2, where the prophet speaks of his mission to the exiles, announcing to them liberty and a happy future. Jesus applies the passage to himself in a higher and spiritual sense, supposing it to contain a prophetic anticipation of his own mission.

It is more than a parallel case. The words were meant to find their consummation in him. They did not find it in the old prophet and his time. But it is likely that Jesus said more than the evangelist gives, and therefore we can hardly reach the exact purport of his words.

(xxii. 37.)

Here the reference is to Isaiah liii. 12. Jesus regards his mission and sufferings as foreshadowed in those of prophets and pious men belonging to the old dispensation. The law of the divine economy, according to which a struggle is maintained between the principles of the world and the principles of God, the latter overcoming through the sufferings of their representatives, pervades both Testaments. It is exemplified by types in the one; by the great antitype in the other. The spiritual head of Israel fulfils what his suffering forerunners shewed in their measure.

(xxiv. 27, 44—47.)

Whether the narrative of this chapter be historical can scarcely be determined at the present day. There are mysteries in it which baffle solution. Doubtless words are often attributed to Jesus which he did not utter. The remark applies to the language before us. The quotation teaches that Jesus considered the Old Testament as a whole to be a prophecy of himself, especially in relation to his sufferings and glorification. It was a type or foreshadow of him who exemplified the fate of God's people in the world in a manner never realized before, to an extent which it had never attained. His spiritual eye saw the divine economy in a higher, more comprehensive aspect than that of his followers.

(John xvii. 12.)

The reference here seems to be to Psalm xli. 10. Judas's destruction is viewed as divinely determined and foreshadowed in Scripture. The pragmatism of the writer puts these words into the mouth of Jesus.

The application which Jesus makes of the Old Testament, and the sense he attaches to various passages cited or referred to, is a delicate subject to handle. Cases in which he employs the words of the Jewish Scriptures as an illustrative parallel, or a substratum for his own ideas, require

no remark, because they present no difficulty. The same may be said where he uses the *argumentum ad hominem* or *ex concessis*. Other examples, however, where he employs the word *fulfilled*, or affirms directly that a contemporary event or person is what a Hebrew author spoke of, cannot be so explained. It may be said that they are *accommodations*, provided the term be rightly understood. He gives citations another sense than the literal and historical, that sense being typical or mystic. What then? Are we to suppose that he did so like apostles, evangelists, and other New Testament authors, whose allegorical interpretations are often arbitrary, the result of their Jewish modes of thought, of a rabbinic, artificial dialectic? Some have not scrupled to place the citations of Christ in this very category, which is surely a bold proceeding. When he asserts that events and persons belonging to the New dispensation are foreshadowed in the Old; that there was a divine prearrangement or higher necessity in virtue of which resemblances took place; that such and such Scriptures must needs be *fulfilled* as they were not before; that he himself accomplished, according to the determinate counsel of God the Father, what was but dimly seen or realized in the past, —are we to infer that this is little else than allegorizing? He may have known the interior economy or ultimate aim of the Old Testament Scriptures better than any modern critic. Indeed, he must have known the mind of his Heavenly Father, which controlled and shaped the history of the Israelites, to an extent it would be the height of arrogance for an ordinary interpreter to claim. Hence we cannot but allow the correctness of the meanings he assigns to the Old Testament. They are higher and spiritual ones, commonly typical or symbolical, indicating a divine prefiguration of facts in the New dispensation by correspondent ones in the Old. Rabbinical dialectic or Jewish midrash is irrelevant here. Far-fetched allegory is foreign to the subject. Believing, as we do, that the meaning of the Old Testament was much better apprehended by Jesus than it is by modern expositors, we accept it. But it should be remembered, that he did not come to teach criticism, or to correct hermeneutical mistakes in relation to the Jewish books. Many prevailing views about the Scriptures he did not touch or disprove, though they were erro-

neous, because the proper scope of his mission did not include the process. He came to teach moral and religious truth. All the references he makes to the Old Testament do not necessarily imply the truth of the contents of the separate books, their authenticity, their absolute correctness, their unity of subject; and to assert this is wholly incorrect, though it has been done by one who takes his "stand on the very Deity of Christ and the entire Bible as his word."* It should also be recollected that he did not utter all the words put into his lips by the evangelists. His speeches in the fourth Gospel are usually of this nature. Not a few of his genuine sayings, having been distorted in the mouths of his disciples and misunderstood, appear in the Gospels in a shape through which it is hard to see the original. One of the most difficult problems is to disentangle Jesus's own words from the numerous sayings he is made to utter. One thing may be safely asserted, viz., that most of the appeals which Christ made to the Old Testament to prove his own office and mission are part of the later traditions attached to his person. His explanation of the Messianic promises contained in the Old Testament is hid under the ideas of the evangelists, and can only be guessed at. But we are scarcely wrong in supposing that he regarded them as symbolical representations of the future, leading on to himself as the Revealer of the Father, in whom they are consummated.

(*d.*) Pauline quotations.

(Acts xiii. 32, 33.)

Here another sense than the historical one is given to the passage quoted from the second psalm,—a psalm relating to the inauguration of Solomon as theocratic sovereign. The divine utterance addressed to that monarch at the beginning of his office is accommodated to the resurrection of Jesus. Jehovah made the latter His Son by raising him up after his humiliation.

(xiii. 34, 35.)

Here the fact of Christ's resurrection is farther established by the everlasting continuance of his reign, which is proved by the words of Isaiah, lv. 3, and by the language of the

---

* See Lord Hatherley's Preface to his Continuity of Scripture.

sixteenth psalm. The former passage relates, according to its historical sense, to David alone, not to the Messiah. St. Paul also assumes David to be the writer of the 16th psalm, predicting in it the resurrection of Christ. This is not the original sense. The author was much later than David. A pious but unknown poet praises God for the protection afforded him, and expresses his confident hope that by His help he would overcome death and enjoy everlasting life. The explanation must be regulated by the ideal hopes of the writer. The apostle accommodates the passage which he cites, enlarging the ideal to make it suit the resurrection of Christ. He spiritualizes it arbitrarily.

(xiii. 40, 41.)

This quotation is from Habakkuk i. 5, where the Jewish people are threatened with chastisement by the instrumentality of the Chaldeans. The apostle uses the prophet's language to convey a warning against unbelief, affording an example of rhetorical accommodation.

(Rom. i. 17.)

Here the words of Habakkuk, ii. 4, are quoted and brought into connection with the doctrine of justification by faith. The prophet says that the righteous man will live by his fidelity or uprightness; but the apostle uses the corresponding Greek term (πίστις) in another sense, that of subjective *faith*. The passage is therefore accommodated to his purpose, as it is also in Galatians iii. 11.

(ii. 24.)

The reference here is to Isaiah lii. 5, after the Septuagint. The sense of the Hebrew is that God's name is dishonoured by the oppression and slavery of the Jews, His chosen people; to which language the apostle gives a different turn by making it say that Jehovah is dishonoured among the Gentiles on account of the evil conduct of the Jews. This is adaptation.

(iii. 9—19.)

Here several places from the Old Testament are cited usually after the Greek version. In applying them to his purpose, the apostle disregards the connection in which they stand and the circumstances of the speakers, who describe classes of persons, their enemies, and their con-

temporaries generally. He generalizes the statements, and gives them a universal application. In the 19th verse, the principle laid down is too absolute, "What the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law," because the Old Testament gives descriptions of the depravity of the Gentiles as well as the Jews. If the translation be, "it saith *for* them," for their benefit, the idea is vague. The whole passage exemplifies the principle of accommodation.

(iv. 6—8.)

Here the commencement of the 32nd psalm is cited, where the psalmist speaks of the happiness of having one's sins forgiven. By a slight accommodation the words are adapted to the apostle's argument. "Imputeth righteousness without works" is added, though the psalm speaks only of the negative part of justification, not the positive.

(iv. 17, 18.)

The apostle says that Abraham, in obtaining justification through his belief, became the progenitor not only of the Jews, his natural offspring, but of all who have like faith. He interprets of believers generally what is said in Genesis of Abraham's fleshly descendants. This gives a spiritual sense to the words of Genesis which the author did not mean.

(viii. 36.)

These words are adduced by the apostle from Psalm xliv. 23, as fitly descriptive of the condition of Christians threatened by the sword. The state of the pious in the time of the psalmist was similar to that of Christians in St. Paul's time. The apostle does not cite the words as a prophecy, as De Wette thinks.

(x. 25—29.)

The twenty-fifth verse is taken from Hosea ii. 23, which the apostle considers a prophecy of the Gentiles about to be received into the kingdom of God. Such is not its true sense. It refers to rejected Ephraim and his restoration. Thus there is accommodation. Immediately after, he passes to Hosea i. 10, which, according to the prophet, relates to the exiled people of Ephraim returning to Palestine, and applies it to the call of the Gentiles to be the sons of the living God, adapting the passage to a Christian sense. In

the citations from Isaiah x. 22, 23, i. 9, the rejection of a part of the Jews is justified. The apostle takes Isaiah's words as predictive of Christian times. Those who deny that he quotes here prophetic words as having original reference to the Gentiles, are mistaken; for it is impossible to explain them fairly on any other hypothesis. More is meant than that the same principle on which God dealt with the Jews should be admitted in the case of the Gentiles. Similarity in the divine plan does not meet the case.

(ix. 33.)

Two passages from Isaiah (xxviii. 16 and viii. 14) are here combined. In the first, Jehovah says that He lays in Sion for a foundation a precious corner-stone, meaning that Jerusalem, the firm rock-city, stands secure in danger; in the second, He announces that He himself is a rock of offence. The apostle takes these expressions to be Messianic, applying the stone of stumbling to Christ, which is mere accommodation.

(x. 5—8.)

Here the apostle contrasts righteousness by faith alone with righteousness by works which the law requires. The law demands doing; righteousness by faith, believing. The words of Moses in Deuteronomy xxx. 11—14, are quoted. In the original passage, Moses says of God's command to Israel to fulfil His law, that it is neither difficult of apprehension nor remote: it has not to be brought down from heaven nor from across the sea: it is in the mouth and heart, so that it is only to be done. In applying this, the apostle enunciates the sentiment involved in justification, viz., simple faith, which is opposed to the unbelief of refusing to accept the incarnation and resurrection of Christ. The historical sense of Deuteronomy xxx. is abandoned, and the apostle adapts it to his purpose. Whether he finds an allegory in it, as Meyer thinks; or uses it as a mere substratum for his ideas, is not clear. Perhaps he noticed the coincidence of the idea, "the word is nigh, in the mouth and heart," with that in his own mind, and founded upon it a kind of proof. It is not easy to resist the impression that he considered the Deuteronomistic passage a sort of prophecy.

(x. 11—13.)

The first quotation is from Isaiah xxviii. 16; the second from Joel ii. 32. The former, in Paul's application of the words, relates to belief in Christ, which is legitimate, because he appeared as God's representative; and the Lord, who is in Joel Jehovah, is also referred to Christ. Though the prophecy does not allude to Messiah, it relates to the Messianic time. Hence the apostle's adaptation is natural.

(x. 15—21).

Here is a succession of quotations from the Old Testament, which the apostle adapts to his argument. The first is from Isaiah lii. 7, where the joyful announcement of the return from captivity in Babylon occurs. St. Paul spiritualizes it, applying the language to the good news of the gospel. The next is from Isaiah liii. 1, where the prophet laments the disbelief of the Jews of his time in his divine announcements; which Paul, taking as prophetic, refers to the preachers of Christianity. The next citation is from Psalm xix. 4, where the revelation of God in nature is accommodated to the heralds of the gospel. To prove still farther that the Jews must have been acquainted with the universality of the preaching of Christ, since Moses and Isaiah had prophesied the conversion of the Gentiles, Deuteronomy xxxii. 21 and Isaiah lxv. 1 are cited, not according to their historical sense, but typically; for the former refers to the Israelites of the Mosaic time being abandoned as a prey to the heathen Canaanites about them, and so provoked to zeal for the true God and His worship; while the latter treats of the Jews, not the heathen to whom the apostle applies it.

(xi. 7—10.)

The fact that the Jews were blinded is confirmed by several passages of Scripture, Isaiah xxix. 10, Deuteronomy xxix. 4, and Psalm lxix. 23, &c. The first two are united, and freely cited from the LXX.; the third is from the same source but not literally.

Whether the apostle regarded the Scriptures in question as proofs or prophecies in relation to the stupidity of the Jews of his day, or whether he considered them mere illustrative parallels, is difficult to determine. The former view is the more probable. The prophetic expressions were

thus fulfilled in the Jews of his time. It should be observed that the 69th psalm is not David's, but the composition of a pious sufferer, whose unbelieving enemies are taken as types of the perverse Jews referred to by Paul.

(xi. 26, 27.)

Here the apostle quotes, as confirmatory of his proposition *all Israel shall be saved*, the prophecy of Isaiah lix. 20, freely after the LXX., intermingling some words from xxvii. 9. The original Hebrew refers to the restoration of the exiles from Babylon, and the deliverance of such as turn from their transgressions. But Paul takes the prophecy as Messianic, and applies it to his purpose in the Greek version which could be more easily adapted. In his hands, the words are accommodated to the time, person and saving efficacy of Christ. According to him, an agency for the conversion of the Jews began with Christ, which is continued after his ascension by apostles and other messengers of the truth, till the result be effected in the salvation of all Israel. An ardent hope of the apostle is supported by an Old Testament prophecy, though the true sense of the latter is very different. St. Paul has, *out of Sion*, which agrees neither with the original nor the LXX. *For Sion* is the proper meaning, i. e. the Jerusalemites who represent the exiles. *The Deliverer*, according to the Greek version, is the Messiah, an interpretation which Paul follows, though it is not the sense of the Hebrew; and in the same version, *will turn away ungodliness from Jacob*, is also erroneous, though it suited the apostle's purpose. The deliverer pointed at is Cyrus; the redemption, a temporal and ecclesiastical, not a spiritual or Christian one as it is in our quotation.

(xii. 19, 20.)

These quotations from Deut. xxxii. 35, and Prov. xxv. 21, 22, are introduced as illustrations.

(xiv. 11—13.)

The apostle adapts to his purpose the original passage, which is Messianic, because it predicts the universal predominance of the theocracy. The prophet expresses his confident hope of a future universal worship of Jehovah, which is applied by the apostle to the divine judgment when all must stand before God's tribunal.

(xv. 3.)

The citation is from Psalm lxix. 9, in which a pious sufferer speaks, whom the apostle takes to be a type of Messiah, and therefore makes Christ himself the speaker. The original expresses the idea of self-sacrificing devotion to the cause of God, and consequent suffering from the hatred of enemies. According to the typical sense given to the words by the apostle, self-sacrifice for the salvation of men, not to the cause of God, is set forth.

(xv. 8—12.)

Here the apostle establishes two things by quotations from ancient Scripture, viz., that Jews were adopted into the Christian church for the glory of God, and that Gentiles were united with them in the same fellowship for the same purpose. Christ became servant of the Jews to justify and demonstrate God's faithfulness in keeping his promises to the fathers. The Gentiles were received along with the Jews, through God's mercy. In fulfilment of divine prophecy, the Gentiles praise God for His mercy ; for the 18th psalm introduces Christ as saying, "For this cause I will praise thee among the Gentiles, and sing to thy name." This is not the historical sense of the psalm, in which David promises to praise God among the nations. It is an allegorical or spiritual meaning. The next quotation is from Deuteronomy xxxii. 43, according to the LXX. : the Hebrew differs. The latter says, "Praise his people, ye Gentiles," which is very different from the Gentiles praising God *along with* His people the Jews. The next quotation is from Psalm cxvii. 1, which is a general call to praise Jehovah, without that reference to the Gentiles which the apostle puts into it. The citation from Isaiah xi. 10, which is Messianic, is appropriate. The passage generally exemplifies the principle of accommodation so often used by the apostle.

(xv. 20, 21.)

This citation is applied by way of illustration. It is a mere rhetorical accommodation of Isaiah lii. 15.

(1 Cor. i. 19.)

This quotation is from Isaiah xxix. 14, where the judicial punishments of Jehovah are represented as defeating the wisdom of the heads of Israel at the time of Sennacherib's

invasion of Judea. The language is applied by Paul as an illustrative parallel, or a substratum for his own ideas. It is an example of rhetorical accommodation.

(ii. 9, 10.)

Probably from Isaiah lxiv. 4. Paul applies the sentiment to the token of God's gracious revelation in giving a higher wisdom than that of the world to His true people. It is simply illustrative, like the two preceding examples.

(iii. 19, 20.)

These sentences are quoted from Job v. 13 and Psalm xciv. 11, as confirmatory of the apostle's statement.

(ix. 9, 10.)

This quotation is from Deuteronomy xxv. 4. The apostle, neglecting the historical sense, adapts it to human labour and its reward. He finds an allegorical or typical meaning in the words. This is an instance of accommodation.

(xiv. 21.)

This citation is from Isaiah xxviii. 11, but with considerable deviation from the LXX. According to the original sense of the prophet, Jehovah threatens the disobedient Israelites with the invasion of strangers who spoke another language than the Jewish, viz., the Assyrians. The prophet, disregarding this meaning, finds in the words a divine declaration respecting the gift of tongues. The argument turns merely on the word *tongues*, which belongs to the original and the citation. It is an example of accommodation.

(xv. 25—27.)

As a proof that Christ will destroy all hostile powers, even death itself, the apostle cites words from the 8th psalm, which refer to man's dominion over the earth, applying them to the Messiah by an ideal exegesis. This is an instance of accommodation.

(xv. 45.)

This quotation is introduced as proof of a psychical body. It is from Genesis ii. 7, with the insertion of the words *the first* and *Adam*. The latter clause contains Paul's own words.

(xv. 54, 55.)

Here are quotations from Isaiah xxv. 8 and Hosea xiii. 14, which are more than rhetorical accommodations; for the first is taken as a fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy; the second, as that of Hosea's. Both are free reproductions of their originals.

(2 Cor. vi. 2.)

From Isaiah xlix. 8, after the LXX. The words of the prophet form a substratum for the writer's own idea.

(vi. 16—18.)

Here Paul uses various passages of the Old Testament as illustrative, Levit. xxvi. 11, 12; Isaiah lii. 11; 2 Sam. vii. 14; Jeremiah xxxi. 9, 33, xxxii. 38.

(Galat. iii. 16.)

This quotation refers to Genesis xiii. 15, xvii. 8. The apostle builds the weight of his argument on the use of the singular number, giving an allegorical sense to the words of the Old Testament which they do not bear. From the absence of the plural, he argues that one person is meant by *seed*, viz., Christ. But the plural could not have been employed to denote *posterity*, because the Hebrew word never has that sense in the plural. It always occurs in the literal meaning of *seeds* or *seed-corns*. To understand *Christ* here as *the church, the whole body of believers*, or *the church with Christ its head*, is unwarranted by the context. The antithesis of *many* and *one* is directly against it. In that case, also, the marked distinction between *seeds* and *seed* disappears, because the latter is really plural, being a collective. We admit that the mystical sense of *the whole body of believers in Christ*, i. e. *the church*, belongs to the term *Christ* in 1 Cor. xii. 12; but that arises out of the context. We admit, also, that this mystic meaning is favoured by Romans iv. 13, 16, and Galat. iii. 29; but these passages are no criterion to judge the present by, which is clear and express. It is beside the mark to cite the words of Galatians in particular, since the apostle's argument takes another turn after iii. 16; and it is illogical to argue that if the representation of *oneness* be inaccurate in one place, it is inaccurate in others. Such midrashic exegesis as is here presented harmonizes with Paul's edu-

cation and taste. It has also in its favour the fact, that the Jews occasionally press a number ; while they even explain זֶרַע in Genesis iv. 25, xix. 32, of the Messiah. Those who assert that the question here is not one of grammatical accuracy, but of theological interpretation, forget that the latter depends on the former. The argument of the apostle undoubtedly turns upon a grammatical error. He lays stress on *the number* of a particular word used in the Old Testament. It has also been said that the apostle's argument is independent of his philology ; which is exactly contrary to fact. The seed of Abraham meant the Jewish people and nothing else. Paul affirms that the Old Testament writer employs the singular and not the plural because Christ is meant. Those who affirm that the term *Christ* means the Christian church, or Christ and his church, have recourse to typical interpretation. In the present passage, they cannot maintain that the apostle intends that church, and therefore assume that he passes from the body to the head, singling out the latter, yet not to the exclusion of the former, because head and body are inseparable. Tholuck's laboured attempt to justify the interpretation of the apostle in this passage, can satisfy none but those who have a preconceived theory.

(iv. 24—26.)

The apostle explains a portion of the Old Testament allegorically, because he thought that such a sense really belonged to it. His Rabbinic education furnished him with that conviction ; for there is reason to suppose that the allegorical exegesis of the Hebrew Scriptures was not unusual in his day. Hagar and Sarah are said to represent the two covenants or dispensations. One proceeding from mount Sinai, the Sinaitic legislation, bears children for bondage, that is Hagar (for the word Hagar is mount Sinai in Arabia) ; a covenant corresponding to the present Jerusalem, the theocracy. But the Jerusalem above, the spiritual or Christian theocracy, is our mother. It is wholly incorrect to say with Palfrey, that the rendering, "which things are an allegory," represents Paul as saying precisely what he did not mean to say. The literal rendering is, "which things are said allegorically ;" and the proposed translation advocated by Marsh and Palfrey, "are allego-

rized" (that is, by Paul), is improperly used to shew that the apostle supposed no allegory to exist before he proceeded to interpret.

(iv. 27.)

Here the apostle proves from Isaiah liv. 1, that Sarah, or the free Jerusalem, is the mother of many children. The original prophecy refers to the great increase of the exiles returning from Babylon. Taking it in a Messianic and allegorical sense, Paul explains it of the spiritual fruitfulness of the Christian church, and pursues his allegorical explanation in the succeeding verses.

(Ephes. iv. 7—10.)

The writer adduces a proof from the Old Testament that Christ gives gifts to men. Taking the 68th psalm as Messianic, he finds the subject of the 18th verse to be the Messiah, and explains *ascension* of Christ being received up into heaven after he rose from the dead. The psalm is a triumphal ode; but the special occasion to which it refers is difficult to be discovered. It celebrates Jehovah returning as a conqueror from the defeat of his enemies, and ascending Zion as the seat of his power. The sense of the passage quoted is different from the historical one. The writer uses the words very freely, bringing out of them, by considerable violence, what suits his argument. It is probable, however, that he considered the psalmist's language to denote what he assigns to it. The points of difference between his version and the original are too palpable to be denied.

(*a.*) He applies to *Christ* what the psalm has of *Jehovah.*

(*b.*) "Gave gifts to men," is substituted for the original's, "thou receivedst gifts among men," i.e. Jehovah as victor received tribute from the conquered. The New Testament writer understands *spiritual gifts;* the psalmist, material ones.

The inspired author proceeds to shew in midrashic style, that because the act of ascending presupposes a descent, the psalm refers to none other than Christ, whose ascent to heaven implies a previous descent to earth.

(v. 31, 32.)

These words, which refer in the original (Genesis ii. 23) to the conjugal relation, are applied to the union between

Christ and his church. "This mystery is great; but I say it concerning Christ and the church."

The citations recorded in the Acts made by the apostle Peter resemble those of Paul. Thus he quotes the 16th and 2nd psalms as Messianic, interpreting them in the same way with the apostle of the Gentiles (Acts ii. 25—32, 34—36, iv. 24—28). He also quotes from two psalms (lxix., cix.), whose historical sense is different from what he gives, for he looks upon the passages as definite predictions fulfilled in Judas the traitor (Acts i. 15—22). How far the apostle's speech is accurately reported, we are left to conjecture; but he uses accommodation. On another occasion, he applies the words of Joel to the Pentecostal phenomena. The prophet describes in figurative language unusual phenomena ushering in the Messianic time; Peter affirms that the prediction was fulfilled by what happened at Pentecost, which is a right and proper application of Joel's prophetic idealism (Acts ii. 14—21). The same apostle cites Deuteronomy xviii. 15, &c., whose historical sense requires that we should either explain "the prophet" to mean the succession of prophets generally, the prophets collectively; or perhaps one particular prophet whom the Jews expected, the Elijah of Malachi. By a typical or allegorical application, Peter refers the term to Christ, in whom, as the antitype of all true prophets, the passage finds its highest fulfilment (Acts iii. 22).

This survey of the use of the Old Testament shews that the principle of accommodation was largely adopted by Paul, who used Scripture freely, not discarding the Rabbinic dialectics of his race and education. Besides his finding in the Jewish Scriptures a typical meaning, which they sometimes have, a prophetic foreshadowing of Christ and his kingdom, he adapted them to his purpose by neglecting the historical, and assuming an allegorical sense. This was done consciously, since he departs not only from the Greek version, but the Hebrew original, to illustrate or prove his position. Thus, besides the rhetorical accommodations which every writer employs legitimately, or parallels which convey the meaning more impressively, there are proof-citations from the Old Testament which shew deviation from the original sense. The attempt of Tholuck, therefore, to justify every passage quoted, as

though no injury were done to the original, and no example of Rabbinic subtlety or violent grammar existed, entirely fails. It is the procedure of an apologist; notably so in Galatians iii. 16 and iv. 24. The commentator's list of citations, which are resolved into mere substrata for the apostle's own ideas, *Anlehnungen* as they are termed, is too great; while assumed prophecies of Christ in the Old Testament, which an interpreter cannot now regard as such, almost disappear under his manipulation. If the apostle adopted a Jewish tradition respecting the rock following the Israelites in their journeys through the wilderness, and made it express a Christian doctrine by supposing the rock to have been Christ himself in his prelibated state, accompanying the march of the people under that manifestation, it is natural to expect that Midrashic views would sometimes influence his use of Old Testament passages.

SAMUEL DAVIDSON.

II.—ROSKOFF'S HISTORY OF THE DEVIL.

1. *Geschichte des Teufels.* Von Gustav Roskoff. Leipzig: Brockhaus. 1869.
2. *Histoire du Diable. Ses Origines, sa Grandeur, et sa Décadence.* Par Albert Réville. Paris. 1870.

IN the year 1201 A.D., certain doctors declared that the 1000 years for which Satan was bound (Apoc. xx. 1—3) had expired, and that "the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil and Satan," was now at large. "Alas for the earth and the dwellers therein!" exclaims the chronicler of Burton, "for if the Devil when bound inflicted so many and so grievous ills on the world, how many and how grievous the ills he will inflict when loosed!"[1] The alarm of the worthy monk was by no means unfounded, for the 13th century was peculiarly fertile in political, religious

[1] Annales de Burton, sub. an. in Rerum Brit. Med. Æv. Script. Annales Monastici, Vol. I. p. 207—208.

and natural calamities. Famine and drought succeeded each other with fearful rapidity; the terrible Mongolian invasions added to the misery of the Western world; heresy and schism on the one hand, and ban and interdict on the other, horrified the faithful and the rebellious; in the next century the black death threatened to make a desert of the whole world;[2] and meanwhile the Devil's personal appearance had, according to authentic portraits, become "both more terrible and more grotesque."[3] In short, the activity of the Devil and his angels was so much more destructively and universally displayed during the 13th and succeeding centuries than ever before, as to justify Professor Roskoff in calling this period "the Devil's own" (eigentliche Teufelsperiode).

It was, apparently, meeting the Devil on this his special domain which inspired Professor Roskoff with a desire to know something of his previous history, and suggested the question, "Whence comest thou?" Nor do the thousand pages which our author devotes to the answer seem out of proportion to the subject when we learn in what style it is to be treated. In a singularly characteristic preface, our author, having followed the Satanic idea through all its historical phases, and up to its ultimate stronghold in the constitution of the human mind and the relation of man to nature, undertakes to retrace its growth, to establish its primitive basis, to demonstrate its activity in all savage or semi-civilized tribes, to track it through every known civilization, to explain the fostering influence of the Christian Church, to point out the various factors which entered into the composition of the belief in the Devil at the zenith of his power, and further to continue the history, no longer of his growth and power, but of his decline and (second) fall up to the present date.[4]

Passing over the first two sections,[5] which contain an exposition of the intuitional philosophy and an interesting attempt to account for the predominance of fear and horror over gentler feelings in the first manifestations of religion, we come to the third and fourth sections, in which the religions of the savage and civilized nations are gone

---

[2] Roskoff, II. 113—122.
[3] Lecky: Rationalism, I. 51, note, 4th ed.
[4] Preface, pp. vi—viii.
[5] I. 1—24.

through *seriatim* with a view to establishing the existence of dualism in every one. This task is apparently accomplished to the satisfaction of the author, but hardly, we should think, to that of the reader; since the dualism established is of so very shifting and undecided a character as to prove nothing at all. Sometimes there is a genuine opposition between two personal representatives of good and evil (sometimes physical and sometimes moral); but oftener there is no decided line, all the deities being of a mixed character. And then we are naïvely informed that in this case the dualism is represented by the different aspects of the same being; which would make that most audaciously monotheistic of all utterances, "I form the light and create darkness, I make peace and create evil" (Is. xlv. 7), a dualistic proposition. Again, in the case of the Phœnicians a dualism is established between sensuality (good) and cruelty (evil) in the persons of Baal and Moloch.[6] At this rate, of course every religion must be dualistic; for we have only to shew either that different deities have different attributes, or that the same deity has diverse functions or various qualities, and the point is established.

There is, however, some very interesting matter contained in these sections (especially the former), some of which is quite to the point. We must be content with citing the prayer of the Madagascans, which is perhaps the best example we could select of what is really valuable in this portion of the work.

> "Zamhor and Niang created the world.
> Zamhor, we bring no petition to thee;
> The God of benignity needs no petition.
> But to Niang must prayers be offered,
> Niang must be propitiated.
> Niang, thou spirit of might and of evil,
> Let not the thunder threaten us more;
> Speak to the sea that it pass not its bounds;
> Spare, O Niang, the ripening fruits;
> Rain not upon the rice as it blossoms;
> Let not the women give birth to their children
> On days of ill-luck and disaster;
> Compel thou no longer the mother to drown
> The hope of her age's decline in the river.

[6] I. 98.

Oh, spare the gifts of Zamhor!
Let not everything, everything perish!
Lo, thou rulest already the wicked;
Great, O Niang, are the wicked in number;
Then torture no longer the good."[7]

In his treatment of the civilized nations of antiquity, when the belief in a distinct evil spirit presiding over moral or physical evil does really exist, Professor Roskoff appears to us to allow far too little weight to political influences in the formation of the conception, and to rely too exclusively for his explanations on natural phenomena. Yet nothing seems more obvious than that the God of one nation or tribe will become the Devil of another, with which it comes into hostile collision. This principle is indeed admitted by Roskoff in treating of the Egyptian evil spirit Set, and even to some extent in the case of "the Christian Devil,"[8] as he is somewhat oddly styled throughout the work; but, generally speaking, hardly anything is made of the ineradicable tendency to confuse moral depravity and political opposition. A most amusing example of this feeling is indeed quoted from Bastian, but apparently without its significance being quite understood.[9] A bushman being asked to explain the difference (from a moral point of view apparently) between good and evil, replied, "It is evil when another comes and steals my wives; it is good when I go and steal another's." The same confusion appears in a more refined form, and elevated from the personal to the political stage, in the speech of Cleon in the Antigone:

> "Never from me
> Shall greater honour be received by the evil than the *good.*
> But *whosoever is well disposed to this city*, in death
> And life likewise shall be honoured by me."[10]

In the same spirit, we remember a Sunday scholar who, on being questioned as to his notions concerning the authorship of moral evil (àpropos of the parable of the tares), declared that it was caused by "our enemies," and

[7] I. 47, 48. [8] I. 72, 73, II. 2, 118, &c. [9] I. 16.

[10] *κοὔποτ' ἔκ γ' ἐμοῦ*
τιμὴν προέξουσ' οἱ κακὸι τῶν ἐνδίκων.
αλλ' ὅστις εὔνους τῇδε τῇ πόλει, θανὼν
κὰι ζῶν ὁμόιως ἐξ ἐμοῦ τιμήσεται.—Soph. Antig. 207, sqq.

further explained that he meant "the French and they." Is not too little attention paid to these political influences in most philosophies of polytheistic religion?

With "Dualism among the Hebrews,"[11] we seem at length to approach our real subject, and at the same time to enter upon one of the most satisfactory parts of the book. The difficult question of Azazel is fully and ably treated, the conclusion arrived at being that his place in the Hebrew ceremonial argues no Hebrew dualism, for he is not a personal being, and the goat is not offered to him; he is merely a personification of abstract uncleanness in opposition to the ideal purity of Jahveh's community. At the same time, the prototype of Azazel is the personal Set, and it is a striking proof of the strong monotheistic feeling of the Jews, that they avoided a dualistic representation by reducing this evil deity to a mere shadowy, impersonal and unreal abstraction before admitting him into their religious circle.[12] In the same way, the dualistic myth of the temptation and fall of man is entirely bleached, so to speak, under the powerful action of the Jewish monotheism, and the serpent is no longer an incarnation of the evil spirit, as in the original myth, but simply the "most subtil of the beasts."[13]

In none of the earlier books of the Bible can we find even the germ of the belief in a Devil. The very plagues and disasters—nay, even the temptations, of men are the work of God or His angels.[14] The appearance of Satan in the book of Job is the first indication of the rise of the doctrine which afterwards reached such a fearful height; yet even there, Satan, according to Roskoff, does not appear as taking a delight in evil, but simply as suspecting the

---

[11] I. 175, sqq.

[12] I. 177—186. The similar custom of releasing a bird with the remains of leprosy (Lev. xiv. 53) is just referred to by Roskoff. It might throw some light on the matter. See S. Sharpe's 'Hebrew Nation,' p. 105.

[13] I. 191. On the whole myth of the tree of life, &c., see an interesting article by Littré in 'La Philosophie Positive' for Nov., Dec., 1869.

[14] A striking and well-known instance of the change of feeling in this matter is furnished by a comparison of 2 Sam. xxiv. 1 with 1 Chron. xxi. 1. In the earlier passage it is God, in the later Satan, who moves David to number the people.—It is an astounding instance of Ewald's arbitrary criticism that he proposes inserting "Satan" before the verb in 2 Sam. xxiv. 1. 'Geschichte,' III. 219, note.

motives of the apparently righteous, and testing their sincerity, not only with the permission but with the assistance of God. He is in no sense opposed to God, and the conception of his existence is compatible with the most rigid monotheism. The influence of the captivity on the Satanic idea is marked, but not so powerful as it is usually represented to be, and it only produced its effect slowly. The Satan of Zechariah iii. 1, 2, the accuser of Israel, and of 1 Chron. xxi. 1, the tempter of David, shew an advance upon the mere doubting Satan of Job, who was still among the sons of God, but it is not a very marked advance; and only in the Book of Wisdom (ii. 23, 24) is the evil spirit (now for the first time called *ὁ διάβολος*) re-discovered in the serpent of Genesis, his motive recognized as envy, and the result of his success as death; and though the belief in ghosts and hobgoblins (including the Lilith afterwards so celebrated, Is. xxxiv. 14) was gradually brought into closer connection with the belief in a Devil, we never find either in the Old Testament or the Apocrypha any theory of a demoniacal hierarchy.[15]

From the point now reached, our author goes on at once to the New Testament, without even a passing notice of the Apocalyptic literature of the last pre-Christian centuries, the Targums or the older portion of the Talmud. Yet in all of these there seems to be available matter, at any rate from Roskoff's point of view, which, rightly or wrongly, embraces every species of distinctively evil agency. The doctrine of unclean spirits is slightly advanced by the Targums, and the book of Enoch (barely alluded to in the latter part of the work) contains the earliest form of the belief which connected the fall of the angels with the curious passage, Gen. vi. 4.[16] Moreover, the Apocalyptic writings, from Daniel downwards, must have had a powerful influence on the development of the doctrine of Antichrist, and so, indirectly at least, on that of Satan; and if they are regarded by Roskoff as post-Christian, he should at least have told us so.

But even if we make the best of what light we can get from Jewish writings, as to the progress of the beliefs in

[15] I. 186—199.

[16] See Gfrörer's 'Jahrhundert des Heils,' sec. 1, chap. 5, for much on this subject.

question in the centuries immediately before the birth of Jesus, we cannot fail to recognize a startling development in the New Testament.[17] The Devil is now a distinct and powerful personality, who, though still very far from the dignity of an Ahriman, is yet formidable enough, and the prince of a great host. The very multiplicity of his names (as well as the significance of some of the phrases by which he is described) shew how familiar and how formidable he had already become in the eyes of the Christians. He is Satan, the Devil, the Enemy (Matt. xiii. 25), Beelzebub, &c., "The Ruler of this world" (John xii. 31), "The Prince of the demons" (Matt. ix. 34), "The Ruler of the power of the air" (Eph. ii. 2), The Tempter (1 Thess. iii. 5), to say nothing of the constant appearances and various epithets with which he fills the Apocalypse. He is the special antagonist of Christ and of Christians (Eph. vi. 11, and many other passages); he is the source of all wickedness (John viii. 44, xiii. 2; Luke x. 19, xiii. 16, xxii. 31; Acts v. 3; 1 John iii. 8; Eph. ii. 2, &c.); he tempts Jesus himself to apostasy from God (observe the germ of the belief in compacts with the Devil, in the scriptural account of the temptation); nay, there are even indications of a conception of the world as divided into two hostile camps, the kingdom of God or Christ and the kingdom of the Devil; at least, ejection from the church seems to have been equivalent to being consigned to the Devil (1 Tim. i. 20; 1 Cor. v. 5, &c.). In later books (Jude and 2 Peter), the mythology of Enoch and the Assumptio Mosis appears; and throughout the New Testament the emissaries of the Devil are constantly active. Faith, prayer and the Christian graces, are the only weapons against the Devil and his angels. This elaborate doctrine and constant reference to the hierarchy of evil spirits, Roskoff regards as a specific development of Messianic and New Testament ideas; and he considers the representations of the kingdom of God and of Messiah to have had a great effect in giving shape and reality to the opposing kingdom of the Devil;[18] although it is remarkable that while the

[17] I. 199—212.

[18] We are inclined to think our author right in giving great weight to these considerations, but surely Strauss goes too far when he says, "The whole idea of the Messiah and his kingdom, without the contrast of a diabolical kingdom with a personal head, would be as impossible as the north pole without the south pole." Quoted by Mallet in Herzog's Encyclopädie, art. Teufel.

bodily appearance of angels is more than once referred to without reserve, that of the Devil is never hinted at, except, indeed, in the visionary and symbolic appearances in the Apocalypse.

In the early Christian centuries, many causes conduced to foster this strong feeling of antagonistic parallelism between the opposing kingdoms of light and darkness, and Roskoff gives us, on the whole, a very interesting and lucid account of the consequent development of the belief in the Devil during the first three centuries.[19] The practical dualism of Gnosticism exercised a profound influence on the orthodox faith, and, together with the striking contrast between the morals of heathendom and those of Christianity, established more and more definitely the conception of a kingdom of the Devil opposed to the kingdom of God, and in some aspects practically (though never theoretically) independent of it, and constantly emulating, thwarting or mocking it. The Devil becomes to Justin Martyr (beginning and middle of second century) the "Ape of God," and Tertullian (160—240 A.D. ?) represents him as imitating in a burlesque form all the sacraments of the Church. Meanwhile the tendency to attribute plagues, famines and the like misfortunes, to the Devil rather than God, appears to have gained great strength, and he was also regarded as constantly active in stimulating and tempting men to excess of every kind.

But the chief interest of our history during these ages hinges on the theory of the redemption, and of the fall of Satan and his angels. Here we find the Devil negociating terms with God as an independent monarch. He was to relinquish his claims on man (based on the latter's disobedience) on condition that Jesus should be handed over to him as payment in full. The celestial diplomatists were too clever for their infernal opponents, however, and the Devil was "cheated" (much to the delight of Origen and other good Christians); when he had got Jesus he found he could not keep him; for he had been deceived by the two natures of Christ, and having swallowed the "bait" (the humanity), was tortured by the "hook" (the divinity), and was only too glad to let both go! This "scheme of salvation" was elaborated by the Gregories (4th century),

[19] I. 212—244.

and remained popular far into the Middle Ages. Bad as this is, it is much less shocking to think of Christ's death as a ransom paid to rescue man from the power of the Devil, than as a propitiation to rescue him from the wrath of God.

The fall of the Devil was variously attributed to pride and envy; that of his angels (after the example of Philo, the book of Enoch, &c.) almost universally to lust.[20] This was partly due, no doubt, to the connection supposed to exist between the heathen deities and the devils, and to the corruption of heathen worship.

The fate of Satan and his host was, in the general opinion, sealed;

"'Twas hopeless, all-engulfing night;"

but Origen's well-known belief in the salvability of the Satanic nature was shared apparently by Justin, Clemens Alexandrinus, and afterwards by Gregory of Nyssa and Didymus.

Hitherto we have endeavoured to follow our author pretty closely, and to epitomise the most important of his results; but it now becomes necessary to offer a few more general criticisms; for in the work itself the thread of the history becomes, at this point, so indistinct and confused, that it is almost impossible to follow it systematically. The fact is, that Professor Roskoff, in spite of the lucid and definite programme with which he sets out, appears really to have had no clear notion of the nature or limits of his subject. His work is entitled a "History of the Devil," a title which seems to us to justify the expectation that from first to last a clear central figure will be presented to us, developing and changing as the history proceeds, and gradually fading away, it may be, as it draws to its close, but furnishing during the greater part something like a personal centre, round which all minor phenomena or characters revolve. In fact, we expect the Devil to stand out boldly throughout, and if imps, witches, or any other beings, become connected with his history, to have the relation in which they stand to him clearly defined, and to see them treated with exclusive reference to that relation; the action and reaction of the beliefs should be distinctly brought out, and amid the

---

[20] Ambrose declined to endorse this story of the fall of the angels, and Augustine treated it as a fable. Soon afterwards the distinction between the fall of Satan and that of his angels disappears. See Haag. 'Histoire des Dogmes Chrétiens,' Vol. II., section on Démonologie.

crowd of diabolical agents the Devil himself should be kept conspicuously before our eyes. Thus to trace the influence of Christianity and all the other social and political revolutions of the last twenty centuries on men's conceptions of a personal principle of evil, and the reaction of these conceptions on politics, religion and morals, would not only be to make a contribution of inestimable value to the history of religion, but would also go far to clear the ground for the establishment of that "positive religion" which is now so much sought for. Roskoff has not done this. His book is not a history of the Devil, but a history of *Diablerie;* and if he had called it a "Geschichte der Teufelei," we should then have had fewer (though still many) complaints to make. Sometimes we find a distinct personality before us, playing a part in the great drama which begins with creation and ends with doomsday; the next moment we are, without warning, thrown into the midst of petty spirits whose ambitions mount no higher than to make a man sing out of tune at mass; and this without the author's appearing to know that he has changed his subject. This is no mere captious objection; for the history of the Devil is mainly of theological and religious interest, that of *Diablerie* —devils, imps, witches—is of importance mainly as a factor in the history of rationalism, civilization or superstition; and to ignore all distinction between them, to pass unconsciously and without warning from one to the other, to seek to establish no connection or subordination between them, is a fault which goes far to destroy the value of a history of either or of both.

A second, though far less serious shortcoming, is, that the quotations, references and illustrations, are often drawn too exclusively from the special literature of the subjects which are treated. This tends to give a somewhat narrow and unreal conception. We want to know how far the beliefs in question sank into the religious (or other) consciousness of the men of the age; and though we shall no doubt find the clearest and best definitions in works specially devoted to the subject, we ought also to be shewn how far the same thoughts crop up in the treatment of connected or even indifferent matters.[21]

---

[21] This criticism only applies to some parts of the book; it may even be a matter of opinion how far it is applicable at all.

But this disproportionate reliance on special literature does not ensure either exhaustive treatment or minute knowledge of that very literature itself. What, for instance, are we to think of a sketch (however slight) of witchcraft in Greece and Rome, which refers to Hesiod, Plato, Horace, Aulus Gellius, and Gregory of Tours, but not once to Apuleius ;[22] or of a historian of the Devil who has studied De Foe's satirical work on the same subject, and presents his readers with a full abstract of its contents, but to whom its author is still anonymous ![23]

Again, the first hundred pages of the second volume contain a general picture of the Middle Ages which is brought into no close connection with the subject of the work, and is, moreover, altogether one-sided and unappreciative, and sometimes grossly inaccurate. For instance, one of the points to be established is that good works consisted, according to the religious teaching of the Middle Ages, simply in external observances ; and to substantiate this supposed fact, our author represents Eligius, a saint of the 7th century, as saying,—

"He only is a good Christian who frequently goes to church, brings gifts to the altar, does not taste the fruits of his land until he has consecrated a part of them to the Most High, and can repeat the Lord's Prayer or the Creed. Redeem your souls from eternal punishment while it is still in your power, give presents and tithes to the Church, have tapers burning in holy places as far as you are able, and beseech the protection of the Saints ; for if you observe all this, you can appear with confidence at the day of judgment and say, 'Give to us, O Lord, for we have given to Thee.'"[24]

This passage is given in essentially the same form and with the same object by Maclaine, Robertson, Hallam[25] and others, and was first brought into notice, as far as we know, by Mosheim, from whom the rest directly or indirectly quote it. Now the sentences here brought into connection with each other are not consecutive in the original, but, scattered up and down, form a very small part of a long passage, which is in the main an exhortation to practical

---

[22] II. 206—213. [23] II. 483—490. [24] II. 84, 85.

[25] Hallam, I find, acknowledges his error (which he says Lingard has pointed out) in his fourth edition, but he does not correct it, and says no one is to blame.

morality. Charity, chastity, honesty in weights and measures, hospitality, humility, trust in God, visiting the sick, redeeming prisoners, feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, are the duties which it is the main object, not only of this very passage, but of the rest of the long sermon in which it occurs, to inculcate. The whole is well worth reading ;[26] and far from proving the "äusserlichkeit" of good works at this period, it shews that if the characteristics of the age were what Protestants assert them to have been, there was one preacher at least who was superior to the weaknesses, not only of his own, but of most other periods. The man who, in the 7th century, endeavours to induce his converts to restore their slaves to freedom, and declares that a breach of chastity is no more excusable in a man than in a woman,—that the sign of the cross is powerless except when made by a good man,—that money bestowed in charity must be the product of good and honest work, not of plunder,—that lying, drunkenness, lewd conversation, must instantly be renounced by every Christian,—that as long as we hate a single man we *cannot* be saved,—and whose constant cry was, "Non quæro vestra sed vos,"—is hardly the man we should select to prove a case of formality and viciousness against the Church he represented.[27]

Most of the faults now indicated will be found illustrated in the treatment of centuries 4—12,[28] as well as in the rest of the book; but we must pass over this period almost without further notice. In the sermon of St. Eligius (7th century), to which we have just called attention, the Devil appears as a spirit of great but limited power, who fell

---

[26] It is to be found in Luc D'Achery's Spicilegium, Vol. V. pp. 211, sqq. (Vol. II. in some editions, it seems), in the Life of Eligius by his contemporary Audoënus. A fairer sample of the sermon is given by Gieseler, second period, second division, § 125, note 2, where we first saw the passage.

[27] The combined tenderness and strength of this man's teaching, the lofty tone of his morality, and the eloquence of his language, will be but faintly conceived from this notice; yet on the strength of a single garbled quotation, one eminent writer after another has held him up to the reprobation of posterity.—While this article was in type, we were informed that this whole matter is fully treated by Dr. Newman, 'Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England,' pp. 92—102. It is very discreditable to Protestant writers that it should be left to Newman and Lingard to point out so gross a blunder, and that their exertions should fail to prevent the repetition of the offence.

[28] I. 257—317.

through pride, and is allowed on earth as a test of virtue and a scourge of vice, who is active in every crime committed by man, allies himself with obsolete and obsolescent superstitions and heathen rites, flies through the air with his angels, and so gets notice of coming events (anticipates the news of them?), waylays and tempts men to all kinds of evil, besets them day and night, is scared by the sign of the cross, but only if made by a good man, rages with increasing fury as his final judgment draws near, and assails with all his wiles the penitent souls he fears to lose.[29]

With this notice, and the remark that the earliest known representation of the Devil in human form is found on an ivory diptych of the time of Charles the Bold (9th century),[30] we must pass over the long period of what may be called the Devil's minority.

And now, without dwelling further on the growth of the belief in the Devil, we will give a few quotations, chiefly from Roskoff, which shew its character in the 13th and following centuries, when it was fully developed.

As we should expect, it is coarse and often puerile, and, even when treated with reference to the redemption of man, possesses no kind of dignity. At the same time it is most extensively held, and appears under the most various forms. Not only are the personal peculiarities of the Devil most familiar to theologians,[31] not only is his immediate action recognized in the most ordinary natural phenomena, not only is his appearance in every conceivable shape a matter of every-day occurrence, but he constantly appears as a semi-comic character on the stage, where he plays a part in the great drama of redemption and judgment.[32] He

---

[29] Luc D'Achery, ubi supra.

[30] Maury, quoted by Milman, VI. 410, note.

[31] Conspicuous among these, according to Cæsarius of Heisterbach (13th century), are his inability to say the Lord's Prayer or the Creed without mistakes, his hoarseness caused by constant burning, and the absence of a back. (Roskoff, I. 319—326.) This curious dorsal formation is not peculiar to the Devil. Roskoff reminds us of certain elfish beings, best known to us perhaps through Morris:

> "And hammering trolls he looked to see,
> And dancers of the faerie,
> Who, as the ancient stories told,
> In front were lovely to behold,
> But empty shells seen from behind."—Earthly Paradise.

[32] I. 359—404. The Devil frequently appears on the stage from the 12th

even proceeds to bring a formal law-suit against Jesus, declaring that "a certain Jesus by name, son of Joseph and Mary, led on by a certain reckless daring, violently tore away and plundered the aforesaid infernal universe from the possession of the aforesaid;" when defeated, he carries his suit into a court of appeal, refers it to a board of arbitrators, and finally a formal instrument is drawn up setting forth the ultimate decision.[33]

More significant than all this, however, is the fact that in the 13th century it was currently believed that large numbers of persons worshiped the Devil *in propriâ personâ*, a point on which we must dwell a little longer. A curious account of the origin of a sect of worshipers of Lucifer and of their school at Cologne, is quoted by Roskoff from Alberic's Chronicle;[34] and many executions by fire took place in connection with the affair. Contemporary with these events also is the letter of Gregory IX. to Prince Henry, relative to the heresy of the inhabitants of Stettin, who had a quarrel of long standing with the Church.[35] The fact of their being recalcitrant in the matter of tithes did not excite sufficient indignation against them in the secular mind, so a crusade was got up against them as worshipers of the Devil, though the plea was dropped when it had served its purpose. The specific charges contained in the latter part of this letter are given by Roskoff, and bear a strong resemblance to those made against the Luciferiani. Some of them are rather more ghastly than usual. A man appears to the novice, of awful pallor and emaciate in the extreme. The

---

century onwards. There is considerable humour in some of the passages quoted by Roskoff. The stage on which these plays were represented usually had three stories one above the other, representing heaven, earth and hell, on two or more of which the action might at times be simultaneous.

[33] I. 349, sqq. In the earlier forms of the law-suit, Jesus is judge, the action is brought against man, and Mary pleads for him. The Devil objects to her, as being too nearly related to the judge. The point always seems to be, that the Devil is legally right, but that the mercy of God protects us. The most perfect form of the "Devil's law-suit," as noticed above, is due to Jacobus de Theramo, a celebrated lawyer of the end of the 14th century.

[34] I. 326—328. It is an instance of Roskoff's looseness in references, and the occasional carelessness of his printer, that the whole of the passage quoted is referred to "Alberici Chronicon," under the year 1223. In the first place, the year is 1233, and in the second place, only the first part of the quotation is to be found there. The account of the school at Cologne, is not there, and I have been unable to find it.

[35] I. 328—332.

novice kisses him and finds him deadly cold; and as the impious kiss is given, all recollection of the dogmas of the Church fades irrecoverably from his mind!

It is in his contests with the saints, perhaps, that the Devil appears most frequently and to least advantage. These contests began many centuries before the time of which we are now speaking; but though the Devil had the advantage of accumulated experience, and every saint had to begin for himself, his wiles were generally without avail. Even when he succeeded, an appeal to the Virgin Mary often reversed the whole affair. Indeed, no man could possibly give himself up so completely to the world, the flesh and the Devil, as not to be able in the last resort to gain assistance from the goodnatured Queen of the saints—unless, indeed, he had renounced or insulted *her*.[36] In fact, the unfortunate Devil was nearly always befooled or cheated by the saints and their Queen, and had only one means of retaliation, that of making a bad smell, of which he seems invariably to have availed himself. An enormous number of stories of the saints and Mary, more or less illustrative of the belief in the Devil, and frequently culminating "mit Hinterlassung eines grässlichen Gestanks," are collected by Roskoff,[37] chiefly from the "Acta Sanctorum;" and those who have access to that collection may add to them almost indefinitely. The connection of the Devil with vermin of every kind is curiously illustrated here and elsewhere.

But the Devil was not single-handed. The instinctive belief in a parallelism between the powers of light and darkness multiplied minor devils to match the multiplication of saints; and, moreover, demons, as adversaries of corporeal saints, became more unmistakably material than the shadowy opponents of the spiritual angels had been.[38] Accordingly, we find in the 13th and succeeding centuries, a host of devils of every rank in constant activity. Cæsarius (13th century) has much to tell us of them—how they play at ball with the souls of the departed,[39] and so on; but the strangest excesses of the belief in minor devils are reached by the "blessed Richalmus," a French abbot of the

---

[36] The legend of Theophilus, frequently alluded to by Roskoff, shews that even in this case a penitent need not absolutely despair of her assistance.

[37] II. 148—205. [38] II. 153 and elsewhere. [39] I. 326.

end of the 13th century, whose book of revelations is to be found in *Pezii Thesaurus*, &c., Vol. I. Part ii. According to Richalmus, the devils are equal in number to the sands of the sea, and are the causes of every moral or physical perturbation. A false note in the choir, an attack of hoarseness, a troublesome cough, a tooth-ache, sleepiness at religious reading, sleeplessness at night, laziness, are all attributed to the immediate influence of demons. Richalmus did not himself record his experiences, but they were preserved by a novice to whom he confided them. Roskoff gives an ample selection from these revelations,[40] but we will produce a few more from the rich storehouse of the "blessed Richalmus" himself.

The devils make him cough to give each other warning of his approach.[41] They constantly take away his appetite and make him sick; but the sign of the cross generally drives them away. Devils in a rage cluck like hens;[42] they dislike men reading good books, especially Gregory's "Morals." One of them tried to prevent Richalmus from reading this work, and at first succeeded; but he soon began again, and then he heard this devil saying to another, "Ah! I saw him reading the 'Morals' again, so I don't feel well."[43] But the most astonishing fact is that fleas never bite at all. What we give them credit for is really the work of devils.

"*Rich.* I send away flea-bites by the sign of the cross alone. Do you too sign yourselves when you are bitten or think you are bitten, and you will experience the same thing.

"*Nov.* We don't all of us find the efficacity of the cross as great as you find it; for I have tried it and felt no benefit.

"*Rich.*...The devils themselves fight against faith. For at the sign of the cross and sprinkling of holy water they suffer terribly, ...but yet they allow themselves to be tortured and bear it as long as they can in order that the man may not experience the efficacity of the cross, and be confirmed in faith."[44]

Now an enormous amount to this effect is extracted by Roskoff, and some of it copied by Réville, without any misgivings as to its genuine and representative character; but we cannot resist a suspicion that the "blessed Richalmus"

---

[40] I. 335—343.
[41] Liber Revelationum, ch. iv.
[42] Ib., ch. xiii.
[43] Ib., ch. cix.
[44] Ib., ch. xlvi.

was amusing himself with the gullibility of the novice, and that the greater part of his revelations were dictated by a certain "spiritus jocosus"[45] whom he declares to have been his constant attendant. At any rate, these revelations cannot have represented the general belief on the subject, for the novice testifies to unbounded amazement by such exclamations as (we quote from memory), "Deus Meus! itane est?" or, "Vehementer admiror!" or, "Non semel aut bis, sed multoties hæc audire a te cupio; ita mirabilia sunt!" His faith is touching, for he always believes at last; but we fear Richalmus and his "spiritus jocosus" must have laughed through many hours of their sleepless nights over it!

But whether this burlesque of the demonology of the day proceeded from humour or credulity, it seems certain that serious belief did not lag very far behind it, and that a host of minor devils imitated at a respectful distance the malice, the industry and the stupidity of their chief, during the 13th and following centuries.[46]

In the 13th century, also, prosecutions and executions for witchcraft began to take place; they increased in number during the 14th and yet more the 15th century, and during the 16th and 17th spread to a most fearful extent, and raged through every country of Europe. As the witches were regarded as servants and accomplices of the Devil, and were executed on the ground of this connection, we cannot pass them by without notice, especially as Roskoff has treated of them at great length.[47]

"At the first glance," he says, "it may seem inconceivable that the period from which our present stage of civilization is usually dated, which exercised a reforming influence by the most wonderful discoveries, side by side with the spread of a Classical culture, which overthrew by Humanism the Scholastic Philosophy, contended against the Feudal System, strove to elevate religion and morality; a period in which the crushing necessity of a reformation of the Church, root and branch, had not only found mighty utterance in a universal cry, but in one direction had

---

[45] Liber Revelationum, ch. xxxv.

[46] For a somewhat later instance of stupidity on the part of a little devil "who couldn't read or write yet," and was overreached by a peasant and his wife, see Rabelais, Pantagruel, Bk. iv. ch. xlv. sqq.

[47] II. 206—364.

produced actual results;—that such a period should be the very one in which the belief in witches, and the persecution of them, and therefore the belief in the Devil which lies at the root thereof, could have reached such a height, and gained such a wide extension."[48]

After reading the fifty pages that follow, we are bound to confess that our author seems more successful in stating than in solving the difficulty. Many of the suggested factors, such as avarice and envy, are unfortunately constant, as Roskoff himself allows,[49] and so cannot explain a phenomenon peculiar to any particular age. Again, the highly interesting legal considerations quoted from Wächter[50] are open to a double objection, since they would in themselves apply to almost any other real or supposed crime nearly as well as to witchcraft, and, moreover, would account only for the increased number of condemnations, not for the origin of the prosecutions. As a fact, too, the chronological coincidence is with the spread of the persecutions in the 15th century, not their origin in the 13th. Roskoff is conscious of the inadequacy of these considerations, but has nothing to add to them except some general remarks on the character of the Middle Ages, which are quite too vague to meet the case, and the suggestion that the belief in witchcraft and the desire to persecute witches was a "psychical epidemic," which is a re-statement rather than a solution of the problem.[51] The fact is, that here, as elsewhere in this work, there is a good deal of vagueness of conception as to the real subject of inquiry. Roskoff generally seems aware of the fact that it is the persecution of witches, rather than the increased belief in them, which is the really peculiar feature of this age; but he never examines the mutual relations of these two phenomena, or clearly defines the subject of his special investigation. The consequence is, that he too often loses sight of the persecutions, and endeavours to find reasons for an increased *belief* in witches in this age. The fact is, however, that this belief had been amazingly active at various earlier periods without producing a persecution, and the probability is that through the whole of antiquity, in Palestine, Greece and Rome, and throughout the Middle Ages, the belief in witches was quite

---

[48] II. 314, 315. [49] II. 343. [50] II. 343, sqq. [51] II. 353, sqq.

strong enough to serve as the basis of a persecution, but the theory of witchcraft and the accidental accompaniments of its practice were only occasionally such as to call one forth. The prominence assumed by this superstition, and whatever real increase it may have gained at this period, might be accounted for almost entirely by the persecution itself; but the persecution, on the other hand, can hardly be explained by an antecedent increase in the belief (even if proved), unless accompanied by some special modifying circumstance. Witchcraft, as such, has always been feared, hated and regarded as dark and illicit, and has often been forbidden by law; but until the period of which we speak it was probably never persecuted, except in so far as it became connected with treason, poisoning, heathenism (which is, perhaps, the explanation of the persecution under Saul), heresy, or some other object of penal legislation. The real questions we have to answer therefore are: 1. What modification in the theory of witchcraft, of such a nature as to make it an object of the severest penal legislation *per se*, took place about this time? 2. How can we account for this modification?

A clue to the answer to the first question may perhaps be found in the belief in the worship of the Devil and the compact with him which had been growing for some centuries, but now for the first time probably was brought into close connection with the belief in witches.[52] Christians have always persecuted those whom they supposed to be worshipers or deliberate accomplices of the Devil, whether heretics, heathens or Jews; and if the belief in the compact with the Devil as distinctive of witchcraft can be shewn to be peculiar to the age of persecution, we shall have found a very satisfactory answer to the question, Why did witchcraft become penal in the 13th century?

We have not been able to gain access to any good history of witchcraft, such as Maury or Soldan; but as far as we can judge from Lecky and Roskoff himself, the facts are exactly as we have supposed. Witchcraft may, of course, exist quite independently of belief in the Devil (though Roskoff sometimes loses sight of this fact, and represents

---

[52] Roskoff occasionally seems aware of the immense importance of this modification, I. 284 (conf. 317), and II. 327, but he never makes proper use of it.

the belief in the Devil as the kernel of that in witchcraft), as we see from Jewish antiquity and from Horace, Petronius, and, above all, Apuleius; and though in Christian times witches were spoken of loosely as "instruments of the Devil," and so on, it seems generally to have been only in the same sense as all evil-doers might be so called, except when the connection of witchcraft with heathenism brings witches into rather closer connection with the Devil.[53]

Again, the belief in compacts with the Devil is of great antiquity; but, for the most part, office and wealth (not magical powers especially) were the objects for which they were entered into; and we strongly suspect that a close investigation of the whole matter would establish the conclusion that the belief in worship of the Devil and a special compact with him, as a necessary condition of the practice of magic, dates from about the 13th century, and is the main, if not nearly the only, cause of the commencement at that time of criminal proceedings against witches as such. It agrees with this view that the witch prosecutions seem, as far as we can judge from our imperfect authorities, to have gradually risen out of the prosecutions of heretics who worshiped the Devil.

If there is any truth in this view of the case, the only question which remains to be answered is, How came the belief in witchcraft to be so much more closely united with service of the Devil at this than at any previous period? The key to the answer will be found, I think, in the fact that in this very 13th century the worship of saints and the belief in miraculous cures reached their culminating point. Gieseler[54] considers Jacobus de Voragine, the author of the Legenda Aurea (died 1298), as the representative of this culmination. Now since many of the diseases and disasters from which the saints and their servants on earth relieved mankind were universally allowed to be the work of the Devil, the position was as follows: Mankind were subject to many evils caused by the Devil and his angels, but the saints and holy angels protected them and opposed their tormentors. The saints, however, had earthly representa-

---

[53] See especially I. 271, 300, 304, and elsewhere. In most of these cases the connection with heathenism is very strongly marked.

[54] 3rd Period, 3rd div., § 78.

tives in every country to assist them in their work; and it seems to be a necessary result of the instinctive feeling of parallelism between the two hierarchies, that certain earthly representatives should be found for the devils, not confined (as the heretics were for the most part) to certain localities, but scattered up and down throughout the world. Now the witches were already believed to cause the very evils which the saints and their servants averted, and since their art was always regarded as dark and unhallowed, the conclusion that they were the earthly servants and representatives of the Devil seems irresistible. Moreover we have seen that the belief in worship of the Devil and compacts with him had at the same time become common through the crusades against heretics; and nothing therefore was wanting to the complete equipment of a witch as a coadjutor and servant of the Devil. Once grant the belief in this connection, and persecution must follow. Envy, avarice, hatred, would fan the flame of superstition; the spirit of persecution, reacting on itself, would quicken the zeal and multiply the victims of the inquisition; the spread of heresy would inflame the church yet more against every form of devilry; and the gloomy nature of many of the reformed religions would steel the hearts of Protestants against the agents of Satan. All these motives, reared on the ever-present basis of popular superstition and ignorance, would account for any enormities; and, thanks to the motives arrayed with such power by Lecky and, to some extent, by Roskoff, even where the belief in the saints and their miracles was scornfully swept away, that in the Devil and his emissaries would long remain.

In his treatment of witchcraft itself, Roskoff gives a far more horrible picture than Lecky does, because he gives us elaborate analyses of the literature on the subject, especially the Malleus Maleficarum; and we see what a hideous mockery of justice awaited the accused, what an unconquerable determination to convict reigned in the heart of the judge, more clearly in the cold judicial statements of the persecutors themselves than in the indignant eloquence of their historian.

No wonder that the humane Jesuit Spee, who had to be officially present at the execution of witches, found his hair white at thirty! He believed in witches, but did not be-

lieve that those he saw executed were guilty. "Use the heads of the Church," he cries, "use the judges, use me myself, as you use those unfortunates, fling us upon the same instruments of torture, and you will find us all to be sorcerers."[55]

But we willingly turn from this subject; nor can we follow our author through the remainder of his work,[56] certainly not the least able portion, in which he traces with considerable power the effect of the Reformation,[57] and of subsequent thought and study, in making the conception of the Devil more and more abstract and less and less personal. On the whole, the tendency of the Reformation was to inflict a blow, the effects of which were not at first very patent, on the personality of the Devil; and a succession of diligent authors followed up this line of attack, sometimes with special reference to witchcraft, and sometimes on a broader basis. Roskoff has given abstracts and epitomes of a vast number of works and opinions on this subject; and altogether this very difficult task of tracing the almost invisible growth of scepticism, is accomplished with very great skill, and a just view of the present state of the controversy seems to be taken. As Plancy[58] says (truly enough from an orthodox point of view), "C'est là de la philosophie allemande (et condamnée) que nous ne donnons qu' à titre de curiosité. On y voit qu'en se perdant parmi les nuages germaniques, Schelling peut altérer les grandes vérités, mais non les nier." Before very long let us hope both Germans and others will attempt the bolder task; but meanwhile we may allow ourselves to put down our hero as Réville does, "parmi les majestés déchues."[59]

We may take this opportunity of remarking, that those who shrink from the rather formidable volumes of Roskoff, will find some of his best stories collected in Réville's little volume.

And now, on looking back through this long vista of superstitions and follies, can we detect any traces of reality or truth? Amid all this heap of rubbish, is there any pearl of great price? We think there is. The doctrine of

---

[55] II. 309, 310.

[56] II. 365—613.

[57] On Luther's belief in the Devil, see Masson's interesting essay on "The Three Devils."

[58] Dictionnaire Infernal, art. Satan.

[59] P. 7.

a personal Devil seems to have provisionally represented a very important truth, to which we are as yet not fully awake, viz., the solidarity and continuity of evil. At the end of an article we cannot develop this thought, but must be content with merely suggesting it. It requires considerable power of abstraction and much thought on ethical subjects fully to grasp the fact, that by doing any immoral deed we take up the cause of immorality generally. No action can be judged purely on its own merits, for every decision on a moral matter involves a principle, and that principle runs through all ages and extends to all lands. If we resist evil, we resist *all* evil, past, present and to come. Now this abstract conception is represented in a manner which the dullest and most thoughtless can understand, by the doctrine of a personal Devil, who epitomizes in himself all evil of every age and place. A very insignificant matter becomes infinitely important if it is looked upon as a temptation of the Devil, and involving either a victory or a defeat in a contest with the collective power of evil. Amid all the grotesque, degrading or monstrous developments of the Satanic doctrines, this great truth may, perhaps, be found, redeeming the belief from the category of unmitigated curses to which Roskoff would consign it.

We have found much fault with our author, but in taking leave of him we ought in candour to add that there are many passages of great religious power and beauty scattered up and down his volumes,—that he introduces us to many interesting authors,[62]—that he epitomizes many valuable books which are practically inaccessible to the general reader,—that certain portions of his work, as already noticed, are everything that could be desired,—that he is often instructive and almost invariably (except in the terrible history of the witches) amusing. We have spent many pleasant hours with him, but have found him more powerful as a philosopher and theologian than as a demonologian. He has given us many pieces of interesting information, has collected many valuable materials, and produced an eminently readable book; but the history of the Devil remains to be written.

P. H. Wicksteed.

---

[62] See, e.g., the magnificent description of a country under an Interdict, quoted from Hurter in II. 42, sqq.

III.—THE REVISION OF THE AUTHORIZED VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

OUGHT the Authorized Version of the Old Testament to be corrected, or superseded? The countless host of biblical critics and expositors, from the Reformation till now, who have published new translations of separate books or of the whole, say Yes. And surely men who have made these Scriptures their special study are most entitled to have an opinion, and to have their opinion regarded as weighty. The period of more than two centuries and a half, a time not of decadence, but of continuous progress in all branches of knowledge, itself shews an a-priori case for a recast of our translation. Any other book would have every new edition revised and corrected, and kept abreast of the increasing knowledge of the subject treated, or the language from which it was translated, and no formal "revision question" would suddenly crop up with regard to it. The Book of books is allowed to go on through the ages uncared for by editor or printer, uncorrected, unimproved, and issued exclusively by printers bound under penalty of confiscation not to alter a single letter. On the face of the matter this appears exceedingly unreasonable, and seems to argue either a singular deadness to the real value of a book which all profess to venerate, or an ignorance astounding and almost incredible in this age, that the English Bible is only a translation which, like all translations, may be capable of improvement. If neither such deadness nor such ignorance be the cause, can it be that the knowledge of the original language, Hebrew, has remained stationary during these ages, so that no better version could be furnished now? On this point, Renan, a competent judge, shall enlighten us out of his "Histoire et Système des Langues Sémitiques." For this purpose, I extract the most important sentences from his chapter on the history of the knowledge of the Hebrew tongue.

"After the momentary regeneration which signalized the advent of the Maccabees, the knowledge of Hebrew declines rapidly. The Greek tongue, whose influence is constantly increasing in the East, soon invades Judea itself. The Hellenistic Jews, who have their centre at Alexandria, substitute their trans-

lation for the original in their religious usages. On another side, the Chaldee paraphrases cause the text to be neglected,—so that Hebrew was perhaps at no time less known than at the beginning of the Christian era, one or two centuries after the period when it was still written.....

"The Mishnic doctors and the Talmudists have no regular exegesis; grammatical observations are very rare with them; they constantly tend to substitute artificial processes of interpretation for the hermeneutical means furnished by philology. However, the study of the holy tongue is so often recommended in the Talmud, as to make it impossible to doubt that Hebrew had after the dispersion become the object of more regular study by the Jews.....The first Christians, sprung from a branch of Judaism which was ignorant of Hebrew, continued almost utter strangers to that language. Origen and St. Jerome were almost the only Fathers who gave any serious attention to it.....

"A text destitute of [written] vowels, and consequently very uncertain as to reading, ran more risk than any other, in the absence of grammatical studies. From the general teaching of the Talmud, it appears that the Jews had a received reading taught by tradition, perhaps even noted by some signs (טעמים) analogous to the ancient punctuation of the Syrians and to that of the Samaritans.....The invention of the vowel-points is commonly referred to the Massoretes (בעלי מסרה). But it seems to result from recent investigations that the first punctuators ought to be distinguished from the Massoretes.....As to the Massoretes, the importance of their labours is more critical than grammatical. They sought solely to secure the integrity of the text. They count its words and letters, compare manuscripts, multiply the notations which mark the smallest peculiarities of reading; but they trouble themselves little with exegesis, and exhibit hardly any trace of grammar, in the sense in which we understand the word.

"It is in the tenth century that the definite formation of Hebrew grammar must be placed. It was the fruit of the great literary movement of the Academy of the Geonim, and of the eagerness with which the Jews adopted the Musulman civilization, which was much more analogous to their own genius than that of Europe and the Christians. It was natural that they should apply to their sacred tongue, grammatically so near to Arabic, the culture which the Musulmans had bestowed on their language: although it is credible that before the labours based upon those of the Arabs, of which the Gaon Saadia al-Fayyumi (who died in 942) is regarded as the founder, the Jews were in possession of the rudiments of a grammatical system.....

"The works of this first school are almost all written in Arabic. When towards the end of the twelfth century this language ceased to be the organ of the Jews, they turned by preference to writing works in Hebrew, borrowed essentially from those of the Arabic school, but very inferior in grammatical science and critical spirit. The Kimchi of Narbonne are the most celebrated representatives of this new series of works.....It was not till the sixteenth century, when the knowledge of Hebrew was about to pass into the hands of the Christians, that the renown of the Kimchi was effaced by that of Elias Levita (who died at Venice in 1549), who carried the Rabbinical method to the last stage of perfection of which it was susceptible, and was the master of a great number of Christian Hebraists.....

"The revival of letters, by the universal activity of mind which it excited, and the Reformation, by the importance which it assigned to the text of the Bible, were the two causes which founded Hebrew studies in Christian Europe. Towards the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century, all the learned world was attracted by eager curiosity in this direction. From that time, Germany especially made the knowledge of Hebrew a sort of private domain, of which it has never since been dispossessed. The Jews were naturally the teachers of this new generation of Hebraists.....The man whose name best deserves to be coupled with this revolution, which was pregnant with such grave consequences in the history of the human mind, is Reuchlin. His three books De Rudimentis Hebraicis (Pforzheim, 1506) were the first Hebrew grammar composed for the use of Christians, and fixed the technical terms employed ever since in the schools of Europe.....This first school is strongly impressed with the spirit of its masters: it is entirely Rabbinical. In grammar it is engaged almost entirely with the derivation of words and minute changes of the vowel-points, without dreaming of rules of syntax. In matters of criticism and interpretation it follows blindly the expositions of the Jews. The two Buxtorfs, especially the elder, are more Talmudists than theologians....

"Another school, much bolder, but less happy in its boldness, presumed to shake entirely off the vowel-points and all the teaching of the Jews. Elias Levita had drawn upon himself the anathemas of the Synagogue by raising doubts on the antiquity of the vowel-points.....Louis Cappel resumed the attack, and, despite the strong opposition of the younger Buxtorf, reduced the Massora to its true value.....But the most important works of this epoch are those on the Eastern languages related to the Hebrew. Postel, Erpenius, Pococke, Golius, for Arabic; Assemani, Amira Sionita, Louis de Dieu, for Syriac; Ludolf, for

Ethiopic, laid the foundations of studies almost unknown in Europe before them, and prepared unexpected resources for the Hebraists....The celebrated Albert Schultens in the eighteenth century practised this powerful hermeneutic method truly efficaciously. He belonged to the great school of Dutch philology which counted among its members Hemsterhuys, Valckenaer, Lennep, Ruhnkenius, Scheid, and whose character was to ally the study of the oriental languages to that of the classical. Hebrew philology owes eternal gratitude to Schultens for the vigour with which he realised his favourite idea, the elucidation of Hebrew by Arabic; although it must be confessed that he applied this principle much too exclusively.....

"Up to this point the labours of Hebraists had been considered as an appendix to theology. The school of Schultens, by following a strictly profane method in the study of Hebrew literature, first placed itself in the position of impartial and disinterested science; but it was the German school which distinctly put the interpretation of the Bible under the same conditions as any other science. Then the knowledge of Hebrew entered the domain of general philology, and shared all the advances of critical art through the writings of the two Michaelis, De Simonis, Storr, Eichhorn, Vater, Jahn, Rosenmüller, Bauer, Paulus, De Wette, Winer, and, above all, through the admirable works of Gesenius and Ewald, after whom it might be thought that there was nothing to be done in the special field of Hebrew literature. The characteristic feature of the new method is an enlightened eclecticism, admitting and checking one by the other all the means which previous schools had applied separately and exclusively. It neither rejects the vowel-points, like the French school of the eighteenth century, nor has for them the superstitious respect of the Rabbinical school. It neither, like Buxtorf, follows blindly the tradition of the Jews, nor disdains it like Schultens. All that a searching and severe criticism can accept, it accepts, having no other aim than that of every other branch of philology, a knowledge as complete as possible of one of the phases of the human mind."

At the time of King James's translators, the school of the Buxtorfs was the depositary of Hebrew learning. How much was to be gained in clearness of knowledge, independence of thought, and impartiality of interpretation, is abundantly evident from Renan's sketch. How much is implied in Renan's assertion, that "in grammar" this school "is engaged almost entirely with the derivation of words and minute changes of the vowel-points, without dreaming

of rules of syntax," we shall presently see. If "in matters of criticism and interpretation it follows blindly the expositions of the Jews," it is plainly not an independent school at all, but merely a medium for the transmission of Jewish ideas; in other words, no Christian school of interpretation had yet arisen; the knowledge of the language was so imperfect and hesitating, that the Christian reader could only see in the words what he was told to see, and could not yet use what was to be later his advantage over the Jew, his position of indifference to previous interpretations and power to exercise his own judgment in settling the meaning of words. Thus the more the English version sought to be independent of the Romish Vulgate, the more it fell under the Jewish influence. The dependence upon the Greek version, which was inevitable where the Hebrew was known only by the use of external helps, tends in the same direction; with the important difference that it reveals the Jewish reading of the third century before, not that of the eleventh century after, Christ.

It will be observed that M. Renan is on no point more emphatic than on the importance of the *grammatical* knowledge of a language; and he shews that grammatical investigation of single words may long precede any conception of the syntax. In certain cases, indeed, syntax may be long ignored, and the want be not at once seriously felt. In English, for instance, a foreign student might have been long accustomed to put words together into sentences without being conscious of any system of laws for the position and government of these words. Were it not for the distinction of case still retained in the pronouns *I*, *me*, &c., he might fancy that the action of one notion on another was not at all reflected in the words expressive of those notions: But he would come in time to interrogative and hypothetical sentences, where the ordinary position of the verb and its subject is reversed ("*Has he not come?*" "*Had he not come I should*—"), and then to the peculiarity of the subjunctive (indicative, *I am*, *I was;* subjunctive, *If I be*, *If I were);* and thus he would be driven to admit the existence of a chapter of grammar of which he had no idea before. It is obvious that the syntax could be ignored only in languages where the power of inflexion is small. In Latin and Greek the existence of a subjunctive and imperative mood

in the verb of totally different form from the indicative, and the number of cases in the noun, invite attention to the reasons for their employment, and thus lay the foundation of a knowledge of the syntax, or law of the proper combination of words into sentences. Now Hebrew stands in this respect on about the same level with English. Its nouns shew no changes for various cases, and its verbs have no other moods than the indicative and imperative. It might therefore be read for long without any suspicion on the part of the reader that in knowing all the single words he did not know all its laws. Occasional peculiar forms, like "If I *were*," might be passed by with slight notice as anomalous. This is about the amount of knowledge possible in the time of the English biblical translators. The fuller knowledge of the Hebrew syntax could scarcely be gained till the study of the cognate languages, undertaken at first by the Dutch school, and especially by Schultens, had revealed the general system of Semitic syntax in still existing languages, Arabic and Syriac, which threw light on the ancient Hebrew.* One great hindrance to any advance beyond the Jewish traditional knowledge was presented by what was really the only basis on which the translators could in that age work at all—the Massoretic punctuation. The original text had been written, as Arabic still is (and our systems of short-hand supply instances nearer home), without any indication of vowels, so that *ktl* was written for *katal*, "he killed." These letters can belong to no other root than "to kill," and therefore the main idea is not doubtful; but the precise grammatical form is determined by the vowels applied to these consonants. These vowels not being written at all, our *ktl* might be read *kōtēl* "killing, *katūl* "killed," *ktōl* "to kill," and in other ways, all of which would produce real words. It is obvious that a deep knowledge of the rules of the language would be requisite to determine which form was correct in any given instance; just as in Latin, if we had to determine whether the abbreviation *lgt* stood for *lĕgit, legat, leget* or *lēgit*. To help to this decision, or rather to hand down the traditional readings, the school of the Massora had applied to each

---

* See, e.g., Ewald's Lehrb. der Hebr. Sprache, 7th ed., § 306 c, 341 a, and his Gram. Arab., § 670.

consonant a vowel-sign. But as this system was not fully completed till the tenth or eleventh century after Christ, its authority could not be taken unquestioned; and the most that could fairly be said of it, was that as it was the manifest duty and desire of the Jews to preserve the correct reading of their sacred language, and no period had occurred when these writings had not been in daily use among them, the presumption was strongly in favour of the authenticity of the Massoretic punctuation. Comparison with the earliest translations, among which the Greek is immensely the most important, supplies positive evidence in favour of the presumption; and the later comparison with the formation and inflexion of words in the cognate Aramaic and Arabic made it still less possible to doubt the general soundness of the system. But while the punctuation as a grammatical system is thus placed beyond reasonable doubt, the punctuators may have erred in many individual words. In how many cases would two readings make equally good sense? and in such cases how often may not the punctuators, being human, and being moreover Jews, have been guided in their choice by personal, national or religious prejudices? Nay, so strong are such prejudices, that the punctuators may even have slightly altered the form of a word in order to assimilate it to others of assumed like formation, or even to get rid of some imagined impropriety of speech and thought. All these cases actually occur, and very frequently, in the Massoretic text. We may have by this time acquired sufficient skill and experience to correct some, if not all, of these false readings of the Jews; certain it is that King James's translators could not afford to desert the Massoretic teaching for an instant. Where that failed them, being not understood or yielding doubtful sense, they could have recourse to the Septuagint or the Vulgate; what they could not do was to extract sense out of the Hebrew independently of the labours of Jewish predecessors.

Now the translation issued under James I. exhibits precisely the defects which have been indicated as unavoidable when the language had been studied only up to a certain point. The knowledge of the syntax is the great deficiency, which is felt in prose in nearly every sentence. A dependent clause, indicating the time or circumstances under which the main action took place, is indicated by a reversal

of the usual order—the subject being made to precede the verb instead of following it. This great rule of syntax being entirely unknown, sentences which ought to be dependent, were constantly translated as principal. Although the facts recorded may not be altered thereby, their due relations to one another are utterly obscured, and what was intended as a mere date for another event, appears as a fact stated on its own account. Take as an example 1 Sam. iii. 1—4.

Authorized Version.	*Corrected Version.*
And the child Samuel ministered unto the LORD before Eli. And the word of the LORD was precious in those days: there was no open vision. And it came to pass at that time, when Eli was laid down in his place, and his eyes began to wax dim, that he could not see; and ere the lamp of God went out in the temple of the LORD, where the ark of God was, and Samuel was laid down to sleep; that the LORD called Samuel; and he answered, Here am I.	And while the child Samuel was ministering to JHVH before Eli, and JHVH's Word was rare in those days, there being no diffused vision;—at that time, when Eli was lying in his place, and his eyes had begun to be dim so that he could not see; before the lamp of God was gone out, and as Samuel was lying in the temple of JHVH where the ark of God was; JHVH called to Samuel; and he said, Here I am.

The impropriety of the translation of the first clause as if it were a new event, told on its own account, "And the child Samuel ministered unto the LORD before Eli," is seen in the fact that it merely recalls what has been already told in ch. i. 28, and again alluded to in ii. 11 and 18. The passage also illustrates another peculiar usage, that of the verb, "and it came to pass," (literally, "and it was," Gr. *καὶ ἐγένετο*). This expression is only used when the true verb of the sentence (the act which came to pass) is preceded by an adverbial clause, expressing its time or circumstances; and is employed in obedience to the Hebrew craving for a verb at the beginning of the sentence in narrative dialogue. Here it occurs at the beginning of verse 2, and is separated from the act which it introduces ("that the LORD called Samuel," v. 4), by the many dependent clauses in verses 2 and 3. As in English the verb does not stand at the beginning, and nothing similar to this

Hebrew idiom exists, the attempt to imitate it by "it came to pass...that," seems uncalled for and absurd—nay, even vicious, since, if any meaning at all attaches to the English phrase, it is that of a *final result*, or a *fortuitous occurrence*, which is not conveyed by the Hebrew word. A more correct knowledge of the Hebrew, therefore, leads us utterly to discard this commonest of biblical phrases from the Old Testament, and, I must add, also from the New, since the Greek *καὶ ἐγένετο* is only a slavish copy of the Hebrew idiom, without any more *raison d'être* than the English phrase.

The beginning of Genesis, which I translated,* "In the beginning of God's forming the heavens and the earth, when the earth had been shapeless and waste, and darkness over the face of the Abyss, and while the breath of God was brooding over the face of the water, God said: 'Let Light be!' and Light was," furnishes an eminent instance of the beauty as well as sense which is recovered by the proper observation of the subjection of the dependent clauses to the principal. I could enlist the sympathy of the most hesitating, were I to comment on this passage: but I have no right to tell the tale twice, and I therefore content myself with referring to the previous article on the subject of that account of Creation. The beginning of the second account of Creation (Gen. ii. 4—7) being translated with a similar disregard to syntax, I gave the following version:†

Authorized Version.	*Corrected Version.*
ii. [4]These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the LORD God made the earth and the heavens, [5]and every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew: for the LORD God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground. [6]But there went up a mist from the earth,	ii. [4]THIS IS THE HISTORY OF THE HEAVEN AND THE EARTH AT THEIR CREATION. On the day that JHVH-God made Earth and Heaven,— [5]when no field-shrubs were yet in the earth, and no field-herbs were yet sprouting (because JHVH-God had not sent rain upon the earth, and men there were none to till the ground); [6]and a mist went up from the earth and watered the whole

* Theol. Rev. Vol. V. pp. 4—12. † Ibid. p. 224.

and watered the whole face of the ground. [7]And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.

face of the ground,—[7] then JHVH-God formed the Man being dust from the ground, and blew into his nose the life-breath, and the man was gifted with animal life.

The comment on this passage must be similar to that on those previously adduced. The act which is announced does not come till verse 7, "then JHVH-God formed the Man," and verses 4—6 describe simply the time ("on the day when JHVH-God made Earth and Heaven") and circumstances ("when no field-shrubs were yet in the earth,...and a mist went up from the earth") of that act. The Authorized Version shews none of these relations, and through ignorance of the meaning of the word translated *before*, makes the "plant" and "herb" in verse 5 to depend on the verb in verse 4. It would be easy to multiply to any extent passages revealing this ignorance of the laws of syntactical dependence, but a couple of clear examples shew this as well as a thousand.

The Hebrew article is *ha*, prefixed to the noun. It is used almost exactly as in English, and also when a whole species is spoken of, as in Greek ὁ ἄνθρωπος = "man." Nouns without the article (except as shewn further on) are necessarily indefinite. Names of persons and places, however, as in English, do not take the article. Yet the English translators act as if there were no article at all, and make their nouns definite or indefinite according to their own caprice. *Adam*, the ordinary name for man (homo), which has the article as denoting the species in Gen. i. 27, and perhaps in ii. 7, they rightly translate "man." In ii. 8, 15, 16, 18, 22, 25, iii. 12, 22, 24, where it has the article as referring to one definite individual, they rightly render it "the man." But in ii. 19, 20, 21, 23, iii. 8, 9, 17,* 20, 21,* iv. 1, although the conditions are precisely the same, they treat it as a proper name, and call it "Adam." Thus the same person is in the same narrative called alternately "the man" and "Adam," without the slightest sanction from the Hebrew. In Gen. iii. 24, we ought to read, "he

* In these, the only verses where the article is hidden in a prefix, we must read לָאָדָם.

placed at the east of the garden of Eden *the* cherubim, and *the* flaming sword." Again, in 2 Sam. i. 23, "lovely" and "pleasant" have the article, and consequently cannot form the predicate of the sentence, as in the translation "Saul and Jonathan *were* lovely and pleasant in their lives." It must be, as even the Septuagint has, *Σαοὺλ καὶ Ἰωνάθαν οἱ ἠγαπημένοι καὶ ὡραῖοι*, "Saul and Jonathan, *the* lovely and pleasant (or 'who were lovely and pleasant') in their lives." The noun which has a genitive following and dependent on it is necessarily without the article, although definite. This rule, one of the most important in the whole language, is not often neglected by the translators: yet, so inveterate is their carelessness in all that concerns the use of the article, it is occasionally very grossly violated, as in the commencement of the dirge, 2 Sam. i. 19: "The beauty of Israel is slain upon thy high places." The liberty taken has not even the merit of making plausible sense, for it leaves *thy* without any reference. "Beauty," having the article, cannot be followed by a genitive, and it should be, "The Beauty, O Israel, is slain on thy heights"—the beauty referring to Saul and Jonathan, the pride or glory of their times. Again, the article used with Melzar, Dan. i. 11, 16, should have warned the translators that this was not the man's name, but his title; and the same may be said of Satan, Job i. 6—9, 12, ii. 1—4. The same neglect of the article is the cardinal error in an important and thoroughly misunderstood passage, Ps. ii. 12, "Kiss the Son." Here the noun has no article, and therefore could only mean "*a* son." But the word used is *bar*, not *ben*; and *bar* is not Hebrew at all for *son*, but only takes the place of the Hebrew *ben* in the Aramaic (Chaldaic) dialect which succeeds to it. Therefore even if the sense required the meaning son, the Hebrew word would not yield it. The meaning may be, "Embrace loyalty," or the text may be corrupt, which is perhaps the more probable. Less important instances, such as Ex. ii. 15, "and he sat down by *a* well," where it should be *the well*, are of constant occurrence.

An error of less grammatical importance, but which may frequently give rise to false interpretations, is caused by the ignorance of the translators that *cōl*, "all," after a negative or interrogative is equivalent to "any." Thus in Ps. ciii. 2, "Forget not *all* his benefits," should be "any of his bene-

fits;" Ps. x. 4, "God is not in all his thoughts," should be "in any of his thoughts;" and so in the New Testament, Matt. xix. 3, "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every [*any*] cause?" and Acts xvii. 27, "Though he be not far from every one [is not far from *any*] of us." In Gen. iii. 1, the serpent attributes to God the unqualified prohibition, "Ye shall not eat of *any of the trees* [not, as the translation has it, 'of every tree'] of the garden," which too sweeping assertion is immediately corrected by Eve. In these instances, the sense is materially different according as *all* or *any* is used. In other cases, either may be employed almost indifferently, as 1 Kings xvi. 25, "Omri did worse than all [any] before him." In others, the translators have rightly given *any*, as Amos viii. 7, "I will never forget any of their works."

Another subject which requires careful attention from translators is that of the names of God. These are more numerous than we should have expected in a strictly monotheistic people; and it is now generally known that they are certainly not used haphazard, but on a definite system. How far the choice of one or another may be taken as distinctive of a peculiar age, how far it enters into the idiosyncracy of a peculiar writer or school of writers, how far it depends upon other circumstances altogether, this is not the place to inquire. But we have a right to expect that a translation which ought to be an adequate substitute for the original to a whole nation will choose distinct words for each of the Hebrew names, and that it will represent a proper name and a title respectively as such. Now the existing version confounds *El*, *Eloah* and *Elohim*, under the common name "God;" and similarly *Adonai* and JEHVH under "the Lord;" and translates *Shaddai* "the Almighty." The merely typographical difference between "the Lord" (Adonai) and "the LORD" (JEHVH), though better than nothing, is insufficient, because intelligible only to the eye. Moreover, JEHVH is a *proper name*, and should not therefore be translated at all, any more than Zeus, Jupiter, Odin, or any other divine name,* but presented in its native form unchanged.

---

* With what vowels to pronounce it is a question which ought to engage the serious attention of translators. The ordinary pronunciation *Jehovah* has been adopted on false grounds for some few centuries, previous to which the

I have sorely tried my readers' patience through my determination to bring, not vague assertions, but documentary proof of the gulf that separates the Hebrew learning of the present day from that of the time of James I. I have chosen only the more striking points, and brought forward special passages only as samples of an indefinite number of the same class. Hence I conceive that these few paragraphs contain the germs of matter which would spread corrections over every page of the Old Testament, or rather which would render revision of the old translation hopeless, and a new unfettered translation necessary.

But I have not yet shewn how we may frequently have to depart from the Massoretic punctuation, and adopt our own. The Massora sometimes corrects the consonants themselves, which form the text, sometimes attaches vowels to that text on principles of its own, which we see reason to depart from. In both cases it may be guided by false notions of grammar, false principles of reading, or false doctrinal ideas—to speak generally, therefore, by false preconceptions. Thus the punctuators refuse to recognize *hu*, "he," as a feminine pronoun, and always substitute for it *hi* when used for "she." Thus in obedience to a misunderstood command not to pronounce the Divine name JHVH, they substitute in reading the less sacred title *Adonai*, "the Lord," or the ordinary name *Elohim*, "God," and point the word with vowel-signs which shall ensure this substitution.* So also the idea that no one can see God and live is so deep-seated in their minds that they alter the vowels of the verb "to see" in passages which express anything about "seeing God," so as to change it into a passive (as *video* into *videor*), to denote "being seen by God," or "appearing before him." Thus in Ps. xlii. 3, the original text undoubtedly was, "When shall I come and *see God's face?*" as Luther has it; but the punctuators have altered

---

question did not arise, as it never was pronounced. The question is discussed, and reason shewn for believing the pronunciation to be *Jahveh*, or something similar, in my "Short Dissertation on the True Pronunciation of the Divine Name" (Longmans, 1869). "The Lord" is merely a translation of *Adonai*, or its Greek equivalent Κύριος.

* Hence the true vowels belonging to the name JHVH (יְהוָה) are not handed down at all by the Massora: wherefore we write it in this article simply Jhvh.

it into, "When shall I come and appear [lit. *be seen*] before God?" and this weak sense, which so ill accords with the eager "thirst for the living God," confessed immediately before, is adopted by the Septuagint and the Vulgate.

But the Massoretic punctuators very rarely allowed the existence of any error in the original text, and generally forced some sort of meaning upon passages which even the most cautious criticism of the present day cannot but pronounce corrupt. These cases must be judged separately, according to the means we possess in each instance for restoring the true text. Where the Hebrew, in simple prose narrative, suddenly exhibits some wildly improbable construction, or some clause with no clear sense, the Septuagint often clears up the difficulty by offering a sentence simple and clear, out of which when translated back into Hebrew the existing Hebrew text might easily have arisen by corruption, whereas the Greek could not have been intended as a translation or emendation of the latter. In such cases, which occur often in the books of Samuel, the corruption of the Hebrew, through the simple omission of a few essential letters or words, may frequently be assumed as certain, and the mode of emendation equally so. The mention of an "adversary" of Hannah in 1 Sam. i. 6, and nowhere else in the story, is probably due only to a corrupt reading; and the same may be said of the "bow" in 2 Sam. i. 18, which so sorely taxes the ingenuity of commentators. The Septuagint version of 2 Sam. i. 19, shews that the first word, "the beauty," is extremely doubtful, and may with altered punctuation be read as a verb, and denote, "Set up a monument" (to Saul and Jonathan); in which case, however, the rest of the verse cannot be quite sane as it stands. In other instances we may convince ourselves that the existing text is faulty, and can yield neither the sense assigned in the Authorized Version, nor any other satisfactory meaning; and yet we may be unable to emend it otherwise than by pure conjecture. In these two cases the translator finds the most difficulty. In both he ought clearly not to attempt to translate a text which he is convinced is corrupt. A faulty text is really no text at all; and to leave a mere blank space is more creditable than to put forth that which he knows does not resemble the text as it must have originally been. Indeed, the latter procedure

is a fraud upon the reader; and it ought to be one of the first rules laid down by or for the translators to keep quite clear of such laxity of principle. In the first class of cases, where the true text is to be inferred with almost absolute certainty from the comparison of similar passages, from the Septuagint, or otherwise, it appears allowable for the translator to adopt it, though not without the apparatus of stars *, daggers †, or other marks known to critical editors. In the second class, where the restoration is purely conjectural, the conscientious translator, if he inserts the rendering of his restored text at all, will mark its insecurity still more strongly—best, perhaps, by letting it appear only in a note, while he leaves a blank in the text itself. The fact that none of these methods of distinguishing between sound text, doubtful or unsound text, and conjecture, are adopted in our existing translation, of itself constitutes a very strong argument in favour of a new translation on new and more conscientious principles. What we want is to know the sense of the Hebrew; and where the Hebrew has none to us, not to fill up the blank with our own impertinences.

Justice has often been done in separate and unauthorized translations of the poetical literature of the Old Testament, to the rhythm which at once constitutes one of its main beauties and reveals its deeper meaning; but the Authorized Version continues to be printed as prose, without even division of lines, much less with attention to the longer division into stanzas, which absolutely forces itself upon the notice of the careful reader of the Hebrew. Yet even in our country the importance and beauty of the Hebrew versification was shewn and proved in translation by Bishop Lowth, more than a century ago!

The exact form and language which ought to characterize the new translation cannot fairly be determined by a single individual. Any committee which may hereafter be formed to decide it, however, ought to consist of scholars of equal and the highest attainments in Hebrew grammar and idiom, and animated by the single unswerving purpose of giving the precise sense and spirit of the words, without secret or avowed fear of the effect of disturbing cherished but erroneous phraseology. The following examples, therefore, must not be taken as specimens of what the collective wisdom of such a committee would ultimately adopt, especially

in the minor elegances of language, but simply to substantiate in concrete instances the general principles previously laid down,—to shew that these have a constant practical application, and that their recognition often corrects the signification of passages hitherto supposed to bear a different sense, or clears up the obscurest. "I rarely read any large portion of the Old Testament without coming across such,—verses which simply convey no idea to my mind," writes to me an acute and scholarly theologian. The passages selected are mostly somewhat crucial tests, where the original is unusually difficult, or, it may often be, corrupt. Words inserted for intelligibility or by way of comment are enclosed within brackets.

Psalm ii.

Why have nations raged,
and [why] are peoples meditating folly,
[and] taking position kings of earth
and princes who have sat together in counsel,
against JHVH and against his Anointed? [saying]
"We will burst their bonds,
"and cast off from us their cords!"

He who sits in heaven smiles,
the Lord laughs scorn upon them,
then speaks to them in wrath
and in anger affrights them, [saying]
"But I myself have anointed my king
"on Zion my holy mountain."

I will tell of the decree of JHVH,
who said to me, "My son art thou;
"I bore thee myself this very day:
"Ask of me, and I shall make nations thy domain,
"and the ends of earth thy possession,
"which thou mayst break with a rod of iron
"or like a potter's vessel dash asunder."

And now, kings, be wise;
be warned, ye judges of earth!
Serve JHVH with fear,
and applaud with trembling!
Cleave to him,* lest he be angry and ye lose your way;
for his anger is easily kindled.

---

* Read בּוֹ. If בר be retained, it must be pointed בַּר and translated "Embrace loyalty."

Psalm xi.

In JHVH I have taken refuge.
How can ye say of my soul,
"Flee to your mountain, ye birds"?
For lo, the impious are bending the bow,
have fixed their arrow on the string,
to shoot in darkness at the upright of soul.
When the pillars are destroyed,
What does a righteous man do?

JHVH in his holy temple,
JHVH, whose throne is in heaven,—
his eyes behold,
his eyelids prove, the sons of men.
JHVH proves the righteous,
but the impious and the lover of violence his soul hateth.
May he rain upon the impious fiery coal and brimstone,
and boiling breath be their portion of the cup.
For righteous is JHVH, loving righteous acts.
The upright will behold his face.

Psalm xvi.

Preserve me, God, for I have sought refuge in thee!.
I say to JHVH, "Thou art my Lord,
"beside whom there is no happiness for me,
"[nor]* to the saints who are in the land·
"and the nobles in whom is all my pleasure."

Their labours are multiplied who have taken other [gods] in exchange,†
whose libations of blood I do not pour,
and whose names I take not on my lips.
Thou, JHVH, my share of the lot and the cup,
thou holdest my fate.
Lots have fallen to me in charming [places];
also my heritage is splendid to me.

I bless JHVH who has provided for me;
even in the nights my reins admonish me [thereto].
I have set JHVH before me constantly;
because [he is] at my right hand I shall not slide.

---

* Perhaps this verse ought to be regarded as a *locus desperatus*. But the above translation rests on the not unreasonable assumption that the preposition in לִקְדוֹשִׁים expresses the same genitive relation as the suffix in טוֹבָתִי.

† If the following relatives (pronominal suffixes in Hebrew) refer, as seems best, to the "other gods" rather than to their worshipers, we should expect—and indeed must demand—a plural אַחֲרִים instead of the singular אַחֵר.

Therefore did my heart rejoice and my soul exult;
my body also lies in security;
because thou leavest not my soul to the grave,
nor putteth thy beloved ones so as to see the pit.
Thou lettest me know the way of life,
the fulness of joys [that are] before thy face,
delights at thy right hand for ever.

Job xxviii. 1—11.

For the silver has a matrix,
and the gold which they will melt, a place.
Iron is taken from dust,
and stone pours forth copper.
He* has put a limit to the darkness,
and to the farthest extremity he is exploring
the stones of gloom and shade.
He has broken open a channel† far from inhabitants,
where the forgotten [miners] hang, away from the feet [of passers by],
away from men they are poised.
Out of the earth comes forth bread,
but beneath her there has been a turning up as with fire.
Her stones are the sapphire's abode,
and this has lumps of gold,—
a path which the eagle knows not,
nor the vulture's eye has descried,
which the proud beasts have not trodden,
and to which the lion has not penetrated.
He has put forth his hand into the flint,
has turned up mountains from the root;
into the rocks he has cut channels,
and all that is precious his eye has seen.
He has tied up streams against dripping,
and brings the concealed out to the light.

Isaiah ix. 1—7.

But darkness will not be to her [the land] on whom affliction was;
as the former time brought contempt to the land of Zebulon and the land of Naphtali,

---

* The miner, whose lamp illuminates the rocks far inside the mountain, which were all in gloom before.

† The shaft, where the miners often hang suspended by a rope, unseen and forgotten by people on the surface of the earth. This verse is difficult and obscure.

so the later has done honour to the road leading to the sea,
the further side of the Jordan, the circle of the Heathen
[Galilee].
That people, they who were walking in darkness, have seen a
great light;
the dwellers in a land of gloom, on them has light shone.
Thou hast increased the population, hast heightened its* joy;
they rejoice before thee with joy like that in harvest,
like that which they feel when dividing spoil;
because the yoke which it [the people] bore, the scourge of
its back,
the driver's rod, thou hast broken as on Midian's day of battle;
because [also] all the boots of noisily booted [soldiers], and
the cloaks rolled in blood,
have been given to burning, a food for fire.
For a child has been born to us, a son given to us,
and the empire put on his shoulder: and they have called
him by the name
Wonderful Counsellor, Mighty Hero, Constant Father, Peace-
ful Prince,
for increase of the empire and for endless prosperity upon the
throne of David,
and upon his kingdom, to fix it and sustain it
by justice and righteousness from thenceforth for evermore.
The zeal of JHVH of hosts will do this!

In face of all these facts, what are we to say as to the call for a Revised Translation? Surely this, first and foremost: that it is not so much a revised as a new translation that is required; that the old translation, whatever its beauties of style and merits of execution, which we may unhesitatingly pronounce wonderful for its age, is now antiquated far more by the advance of Hebrew grammatical knowledge since it was produced than by its own English style; and that the best scholars will not be content to labour at patching up what must to them be an inferior work, but require to work freely if they are to work at all. It is only the second-rate scholars, whose level of grammatical knowledge is nearer to that of the seventeenth century, who will be really satisfied to do the small amount of revision to which it appears Bishop Ellicott would tie them down. Unless, therefore, *Revision* be merely a milder term

* Read לוֹ for לֹא, with the Massora.

addressed to the conservative religious world to induce them to adopt a translation really new in all points which require renewing (which is scarcely honest), it is not a proceeding from which a truly scholarly and satisfactory version of the Old Testament (of which alone we speak here) can be expected. It need hardly be said that a really new translation might and should retain the greater part of the accustomed phraseology, and probably would look wonderfully like the old Bible: but the translators ought not to be warned, as Bishop Ellicott warns them as if in mockery of their function, against "improving." This is positively frightening them out of their obvious duty at the very outset.

RUSSELL MARTINEAU.

IV.—THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE.

Essays, chiefly on Questions of Church and State, from 1850 *to* 1870. By A. P. Stanley, D.D., Dean of Westminster. London: Murray. 1870.

The Four Cardinal Virtues, considered in relation to the Public and Private Life of Catholics: Six Sermons for the Day. With an Appendix on the Dissolution of the Union between Church and State, and on the Establishment of an Oratory in London. By the Rev. Orby Shipley, M.A. London: Longmans. 1871.

M. RENAN, seeking to account for the peculiarities of the Book of Acts, describes its author as one of those kindly men, of a type rather Catholic than Protestant, whose natural disposition it is to extenuate differences and to multiply points of agreement; who prefer to contemplate fundamental likenesses, rather than to enumerate transitory diversities; who think no discord too harsh to be harmonized, no contradiction too sharp to be reconciled; who never will believe in a fight till the weapons are actually cleaving the air, and when peace is restored are apt to persuade themselves that there never was any fight at all. More than once, as we have read the portly volume in

which the Dean of Westminster has collected the Essays upon ecclesiastical subjects which he has published during the last twenty years, have we been reminded of this character. These articles chiefly refer to the great internal struggles in which the Church of England has been engaged from the Gorham controversy down to the disestablishment of the Irish Church: others, interesting and valuable in their way, and well deserving a place in the volume, on Hare, Keble, the Archbishop Philaret, have only a loose connection with the rest. They all convey the impression of Dean Stanley's cultivated mind and genial sympathies, with which English readers are by this time tolerably familiar: they are the pleasantest reading imaginable; and they give additional testimony, if it were needed, to the fact, that their author can stand bravely in defence of the liberties of a heretic, in whose heresies he has no part. But though their tale is of ecclesiastical struggle and turmoil and panic, they are pervaded by a strangely hopeful and peaceful spirit. Men are quite mistaken in supposing that the Church of England is being rent by intestine divisions; the fact is, if they would only think so, and look at things from the point of view of Westminster Abbey, that she is going on in a prosperous career of development and usefulness. Every succeeding judgment of the Final Court of Ecclesiastical Appeal has tended to enlarge the liberties of the Church: the Gorham case is the palladium of the Evangelicals, the Essays and Reviews' judgment, of the Broad Church. True, poor Mr. Heath was condemned; but he is "an unfortunate instance of a clergyman having been deprived of his benefice virtually because he was deaf;"* and when these Essays were republished, both Mr. Maconochie's suspension, and the deprivation which seems suspended over Mr. Voysey's head, were yet in the darkness of the future. And the worst of these disturbances have been really quite needless. There was nothing in Essays and Reviews (which, by the way, ought to have been written in Latin) that men did not know before; and the true responsibility of the turmoil rests with the Westminster Review.† So, again, "Whatever there is good and true in the labours of the Bishop of Natal has, I think, been suffi-

* P. 362.

† Pp. 50, 61, 70.

ciently done in Germany; and therefore I cannot think that the world in general would have lost anything if his work on the Pentateuch had never been written at all."* Now that the stringency of subscription has been relaxed, the Articles, the Prayer Book, and the Act of Uniformity, afford a sufficient ground of union for all Christian men. All that is needful is, that theological partizans should abstain from litigation (though if all litigation ends in added freedom, it is difficult to see the objection to it), and that "the accuser and the accused" should meet "face to face, with friends chosen by each on either side."† And then, above all, the Church must cling to its connection with the State, and learn to be content with its subjection to Parliament. Given these conditions, the republic is saved: Ritualist and Evangelical, High-Churchman and Dissenter, will lie down together like the lion and the lamb; the Church of England will once more become the Church of the English nation; and the theology of the 19th century, as variously represented in the writings of Keble and of Jowett, of Montalembert and of Maurice, will have free course and be glorified.

It may be interesting to contrast this rosy-coloured picture with another painted by an Anglo-Catholic hand. In a little book, called "The Four Cardinal Virtues," but of which the discourses on that subject are the least and least important portion, Mr. Orby Shipley writes, in a sermon entitled "Episcopal Authority not Unlimited," in the following vigorous strain :‡

"Our position, to speak plainly, amongst others not less anomalous, consists of the following factors. A Church, with overpowering advantages as the world thinks, spiritual and temporal, which exercises less influence on the nation than any other Church in Christendom. A Clergy, of social position and means, of intellect, education and refinement, without precedent, which yet possesses no acknowledged power in society as Priests. An Establishment, not only *de jure* in corporate union with, but *de facto* in slavish subordination to a State, which by a godless Education Bill has now cast aside almost the last links of a national Christianity. A Body of CHRIST, even His Spouse, tyrannized over by a Popular Assembly, of which upwards of one-sixth part, and the proportion is advancing, consists of open

---

* P. 313. † Preface, p. xxvi. ‡ P. 212.

foes to the faith. An Episcopate nominated by the leader for the moment of the leading faction of the day in this Assembly—a leader who may be of any religion or of none. Houses of Convocation, the Church by representation, in nearly the same imperfect condition in which they existed at the time of the Tudors; three-fourths of which, in our Province, are composed of State nominees of the first or second degree, and one-fourth of which—with shame be it spoken—represent the monetary interests of the beneficed clergy only. Ecclesiastical Courts, so called, of which the inferior indeed possesses a Church style and title, and is administered solely by a layman; of which the superior is essentially a Secular Court, created by Act of Parliament. Lastly, a laity, in a vast proportion of the empire, external to the Church; honeycombed with heresy and unbelief, eaten up with immorality and sin; whose virtues at the best are on a par with those of heathen morality; whose vices, in the domestic circle, in mercantile transactions, and in public life, fall lamentably below such a standard."

If a pile of Evangelical books lay ready to our hand, it would be easy to furnish a counterpart to the foregoing diatribe. The theme would be different, but the general character of the concerto the same. Rome, Ritualism and Rationalism—these are the Record's "three R's," the simple elements of theological scolding, which it exhibits in endless permutation and combination. Mr. Orby Shipley cries out loudly for disestablishment and Church law administered by Churchmen: the Evangelicals have no objection to lay courts, which they think may be trusted to decide in their favour, or to lay assemblies, which they know will legislate for the Church as little as they can. But not the less are they full of wrongs and discontents, on which they brood not altogether in silence: nothing can be harder to bear than to see traitors to the Church not only eating the Church's bread, but paralyzing the efforts and stealing the congregations of her faithful sons. And we are afraid that it is of very little use for a mild mediator like Dean Stanley to come between these angry controversialists and assure them, that if they would only withdraw untenable pretensions on both sides, and try to understand each other a little more fully and more kindly, they might be at peace. Not only is this precisely what they will not do, but we have grave doubts as to whether the Articles and the Prayer Book are that primitive and immovable basis of

Church fellowship which Dean Stanley seems to think them. There is a time for everything, says the Wise Man, and assuredly a time when compromise, however amiable, is a treason to truth, and conflict, however sharp, a homage to duty. Perhaps each of the combatants is narrow-minded in seeing only that side of the proverbial shield which is turned to him; but either of them is truer to fact than the wayfarer who, peering round the edge to this side and that, endeavours to allay their rage by declaring that both sides are alike.

Dean Stanley's view, that the successive judgments of the Privy Council, the almost completed opening of the Universities, and the relaxation of the terms of subscription, justify a confident hope for the future union and usefulness of the English Church, is hardly borne out by the facts. For during the whole of the twenty years over which his Essays reach (1850—1870), distinctions of party within the Church have been growing more marked, and animosities have been gathering a perpetually greater bitterness. Two main series of events have characterized this period; one, the sudden revival of the Ritualists from the ashes of the old Anglo-Catholic party; the other, the panics and protests of the Church, as one manifestation of heretical and latitudinarian opinion has succeeded another. We have been living in an atmosphere of perpetual storm. Each party has denounced the other with an equal energy of vituperation; this has turned the word Protestant into an epithet of contempt, and that has used Romish with an obvious connotation of treason. Each has announced its intention of never forsaking the venerable mother of souls, and each has expressed its wonder why common honesty does not bid the other forsake her. Now and then both have joined hands to condemn a book which half the self-elected judges had not read, or to base the faith in eternal life on the foundation of belief in eternal fire; but the fortuitous alliance has soon been dissolved, and the allies have fallen to fighting once more. Unfortunately for Dr. Stanley's theory, the one thing that nobody seems to care about, not even the Dissenters, is the alteration in the terms of subscription. That truly conciliatory measure has so far been followed only by an increase in the number of ecclesiastical prosecutions. During the whole of these twenty years, the

Court of Arches and the Privy Council have never been as busy as they are now. Every year makes it plainer to any calm and candid observer, who can look at the course of events without, on the one hand, a personal affection for the Church of England, or, on the other, a bias against establishments, that the time at which the Evangelical and Sacramental parties will find it impossible to live together within the same pale, is rapidly drawing near.

The chief disruptive force now at work within the Church of England is undoubtedly that exercised by the Ritualist, or, as they prefer to be called, the Catholic party: directly, by their own desire for disestablishment; indirectly, by the repulsion which they inspire in all Evangelical Churchmen. The student of English Church history does not need to be told that a leaven of sacerdotal and sacramental doctrine remained in the Church after the Reformation, and that a corresponding ecclesiastical activity has never failed to manifest itself, from the time when Anglicanism assumed a character of its own, down to the present day. The High-churchmen under Laud, the Nonjurors under Sancroft and Ken, the Tractarians under Pusey and Newman, were the legitimate ancestors of the Catholic party, who now aim to make all things new by transforming them into the likeness of the old. Each outbreak of Anglo-Catholicism has had its own special character, impressed upon it by men and circumstance, and each, so far, has come to an untimely, we might almost say, a violent end. Laud and his compeers were trampled under the iron foot of the Great Rebellion; the Nonjurors represented only a political dilemma and a dying cause; the Tractarians were discouraged and disintegrated by the secession of their leader. But just at the time when men, who looked more to the efficacy of party organization than to the force of ideas, were congratulating themselves that the Puseyite bubble had burst, and that the Church of England had gained a more decent solemnity of ritual without having forfeited anything of its Protestant character, the party sprang to renewed life and activity with marvellous suddenness and vigour. Not now in the Universities, but in the parish churches, not in the venerable cloisters and comfortable common-rooms of Oxford, but in the alleys of London and in the squalid abodes of the poor, were the new heresiarchs to be found. And there was a

fresh outspokenness about them, both in word and action. Once the struggle was for the surplice—now it is for the Eucharistic vestments; formerly it was a sign of progress to say matins for morning prayer—now there is no hesitation in calling the Communion the Mass; then there was war for a credence-table and an altar of stone—now it is for lights and incense, and processions and banners. We need not pause to insist upon the dogmatic peculiarities and the ecclesiastical pretensions of this party; how their aim is to substitute the sacrificial form of worship for the common prayer, and how closely they imitate the Mass in their "high celebrations;" how firmly they hold to the doctrine of the Real Presence; how highly they exalt the sacerdotal character, and consequently the prerogatives and functions, of the Church; how eagerly they desire to reform the Reformation, and to restore English religion to what it was before the time of Cromwell and of Cranmer; how earnestly they aspire to what they call the Re-union of Christendom. The important thing to note is, that these men, the business of whose life it is to infuse into the English mind that sacramental theory of religion which has hitherto been best known as Roman, form at the present moment the most active, zealous and successful party in the Church of England. They thoroughly believe in their system. They have ideas for which they are willing to make almost any sacrifice. They are conspicuously faithful in Christian and philanthropic work. They make converts at either end of the social scale. They are beginning to think that they have a national future before them. *And they do not secede to Rome.*

There was a time, not very long ago, when Ritualism was set down by men who thought themselves eminently sensible and practical, as mere clerical dandyism and man-millinery, the foolish ambition of weak-minded curates to wear a gorgeous stole and to shine in a pompous "function." Then, when this supposition was evidently inadequate, the same critics fell back upon the æsthetic element in religion, and ascribed the new phenomena to an over-eager desire to lay Art under full contribution to Worship. Now that the dogmatic character of the movement is unmistakably manifest, they are inclined to retreat upon their insular Protestantism, and to hug themselves in the confident belief that

Roman Catholic doctrines and practices are quite alien to the English intellect. For ourselves, we are so far from assenting to this, as to believe that in England, as elsewhere, there is a very large class of minds to which a sacramental theology, with all that it involves, is irresistibly attractive; and that the only thing needed to lead them captive was to present these ideas to them in any other than the Roman form, which a long Protestant tradition had rendered terrible and hateful. English Protestant theologians have, for the most part, vituperated Rome without taking the trouble to understand her; and those whom they ought to have instructed fear and dislike her name, though they do not recognize her principles when they see them. And we confess that, from the inherent attractiveness of sacramental ideas, from their comparative novelty to Protestant minds, and from the genuine zeal of those who preach them, we augur for them a much wider prevalence than they have yet attained. There will always be those who long to lay down their doubts at the feet of Authority. There will always be those who crave a sensuous religion and a minute moral guidance.

From one point of view we might ask the questions, "Are these ideas, so developed, consistent with the standards of the Church? or can Churchmen of a more Protestant type be induced to suffer the presence of these men within the same pale?" One of these questions the law will answer, the other, public opinion; but in the mean time the Catholic party loudly proclaim their desire to attain a position beyond the reach of the law, and where public opinion does not utter itself in Acts of Parliament. For a long time they (and not they only, but all the High-churchmen) have been lashing themselves into courage to demand the separation of Church and State. What they want may be broadly stated in one word—self-government; and of late, more particularly, because they think that self-government would involve power to free themselves from complicity in scandals which are fastened upon them by State connection. It has long been hard for them to see the Wesleyan Conference exercising a power of excommunication which they do not themselves possess, and expelling a heretic while they can only vituperate a bishop. But this mortification has been made infinitely more intense by recent events,

over which the Church has had no control, but which are felt to taint her purity as a body, while they impair the soundness of every limb and organ. There was the judgment in Essays and Reviews; there was the heresy of Bishop Colenso; there was the appointment of Dr. Temple; last and worst, there is the Westminster Communion; in every one of these cases the law is powerless or perverse: what is left for faithful Churchmen but the melancholy satisfaction of a protest? And so protest after protest has been signed, till the anodyne, too often administered, is beginning, we fear, to lose its power of quieting clerical consciences, and there is nothing left but to renounce a connection in which every year develops a new possibility of annoyance and disgrace. Much of Mr. Orby Shipley's book (from which we have already quoted) might have been written in the interests of the Liberation Society, though hardly from its point of view. Here is his catalogue of grievances:*

"I need only glance at some results, either actual or impending, of modern legislation, from a Church point of view. And the fount and source of all injustice to the Church lies in this one fact, that, so far as by law established, and on the earthly side of her spiritual existence, she is in absolute subjection to the will and pleasure of a temporary majority in the House of Commons. Nor does this statement convey the whole truth, until we consider that this majority both guides and acts for a popular assembly, of which, after little more than a century of reformed existence, one-sixth part are not only not conventional members of the Church, but are numbered amongst her most bitter enemies. Mark, my brethren, what flows from this source. Hence the Church is debarred from self-legislation and self-government; for her houses of Convocation are only not silenced, and her Bishops are mere nominees of the leader of the leading party in the country. Hence the discipline of the Church is in abeyance; for she possesses no courts in any sense Catholic, and she is at once powerless to condemn heresy, to punish immorality, or to vindicate her claims to her ancient worship. Hence divorce is facilitated, if not encouraged; polygamy is permitted, if only one wife be retained at a time; adultery is actually legalized; and incest is only not yet sanctioned. Hence, again, registration of births has long since taken the place of Baptism in popular

---

* P. 9 et seq.

estimation, and the Sacrament of Marriage has been secularized in the Registrar's office. Hence the property of the Church has been transferred to a Commission—ironically misnamed Ecclesiastical—practically irresponsible ; and consequently it has been diverted, misapplied and squandered. Hence, again, the education of the nation—both the right to educate and the power of educating—is to be denied to the Church, in part at the Universities, in part at the public schools, wholly, so far as God's Truth is concerned, in our parish schools. Hence too, though I fear you may be wearied, God's Own Acre, the ground consecrated for the Church's holy dead, at this moment is the battle-field of contending parties ; and hence an agitation is gathering force to enable her Priests, so far as it is possible, to abjure their Holy Orders.

"I have thus placed in one ghastly catalogue of sin, amongst other cases that might be mentioned, many notable instances in which the State has departed, or is about to depart, from the principle of corporate union with the Church of Christ, while still holding the Church to the form, and enforcing upon her the disabilities, of such a union."

We might quote other passages in which Mr. Shipley pronounces the connection between Church and State to be "almost as bad, almost as immoral, almost as anti-christian, as it possibly could be ;"* in which he calls it "a wicked, immoral and godless alliance ;"† in which he claims for the Catholic party the "high and holy mission" of effecting a disestablishment which he more than once hails as "blessed." But it is not necessary. It is enough to note that this is no mere theory in the minds of Anglo-Catholics. They are dominated by an idea ; and men dominated by ideas can make sacrifices. Perhaps they have less to sacrifice, at all events of a worldly kind, than some others ; for they do more than their share of the Church's work on less than their share of the Church's wealth. But, however this may be, we do not expect them to shrink from the practical consequences of their principles when the hour of action strikes.

Upon the activity and success of Ritualism, the great Evangelical party looks with unconcealed but helpless terror. It is still the majority in the Church ; it is backed by all the force of inertia ; it wields the social influence of

* P. 151. † P. 170.

what may be called the average Churchman, both clerical and lay. But, in the intellectual point of view, it is a decaying party. It lives upon the report of ideas, efforts, triumphs, the power of which is spent. Sixty years ago, in the days of Simeon, Wilberforce and Venn, it touched the conscience of the nation, if it did not awaken and satisfy its intellect; now it finds that the way to the conscience is through the intellect, and learns to its discomfiture that it is no more fruitful of work and sacrifice than forms of faith or unfaith with which it knows not how to argue. It never was successful in producing men who left a mark upon the mind of England, and was always disposed to qualify literature and philosophy as "carnal;" but now it is a crowd almost without leaders. Shaftesbury, McNeile, Close, Bickersteth, Wilson, Ryle, are names which, except to Evangelical ears, carry little weight; yet, with the clergy and laity of ten thousand parishes to choose from, these, with a very few more of even less notoriety, are the men who are suffered to monopolize the platforms of the May Meetings. Not many months ago, a wail went up because of all the Bishops with whom Mr. Gladstone almost repopulated the Bench, not one was impressed with the true Evangelical seal. What did it mean, except that the party has ceased to furnish the material of which even Bishops can be made? It produces no theological literature of any force; for the questions on which the public mind is powerfully stirred,—the authority of the Bible and its relation to scientific truth, the atonement, and the eternity of future punishment,—are precisely those in regard to which it can do nothing but repeat the old formulas. It is profoundly conservative in practice, not daring to branch out into this or that new activity, lest perchance it should involve a concession to Rationalism or have contracted a taint of Romanism. It finds itself incapable of effective union, and wonders why; being ignorant that not a common belief, but the enthusiasm for a belief, is that which organizes men into a living whole. It utters the familiar shibboleths, and complains that they seem to have lost their power: it tries to wield the sword of Wesley and of Whitefield, without suspecting that the strength was in the men, not in the weapon. So it clings with helpless tenacity to the *status quo* in Church and State; and mean-

while finds what comfort it can in protests and prosecutions.

But these parties, it will be said, do not make up the whole Church, and are not themselves fairly represented by their extremes. In either, and especially among the Evangelicals, are a large class of men who are more concerned with doing their daily duty than with following out their principles to a logical end; and many more, among the most influential men in the Church, who are committed to neither party. There are the Broad-churchmen, there are the High-churchmen, who are not without liberal tendencies and sympathies; who do the Church's work in literature and at the Universities; who read German and study science, and are not afraid of the questions of the day. In so far as these men have a theory of the future connection between Church and State, it would, we suppose, be similar to Dean Stanley's; they make light in their own minds of existing differences and discords; they think that a gradual widening of the Church is taking place, which will leave room for all reasonable diversity, and that the extreme men will secede; they place great reliance upon the revival of the Church's practical activity and its increased hold upon the affections of the people; they imagine that the Church, constituted as it is, and holding a kind of middle place in Christendom, is peculiarly well fitted to establish a compromise between æsthetic religion, on one side, and severe scientific truth, on the other. But of this party, if party it may be called, which includes a larger number of the educated and thoughtful laity than any other, and is therefore in most accord with ruling powers in the State, we are compelled to ask, Has it any policy? Does it *do* anything but wait the course of events? Does it not practically rely upon the perpetuity of the compromise effected in the reign of Elizabeth? And if this be so, it must constantly suffer weakening at the hands of less judicious and, perhaps, less thoughtful men, who, at all events, know distinctly what they want, and are determined to make it real.

And this leads us naturally to the consideration of another very important element in this problem—the action of the State. We do not follow Mr. Shipley in including under this head the decision of the Law Courts, which are, indeed, only legal developments of State action completed

centuries ago; we mean the action of Parliament and of Ministries in the exercise of Church patronage. And it is absolutely notorious, that so far as the internal constitution of the Church is concerned, all that Parliaments and Governments desire is to let things *drift*, and to avoid the responsibility of a policy. The disestablishment of the Irish Church was the easiest escape from a political dilemma, and, except by the consistent enemies of all establishments, was chiefly welcomed on that ground; as one day, we think, will be a proposition for summarily ending all ecclesiastical debates by the disestablishment of the English Church also. The Subscription Bill was a measure which stood in the same relation to all religious parties, and was besides, we suspect, estimated at a truer value by politicians than by clergymen. Other measures, passed or about to pass,—the University Tests' Bill, the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, the Burial-grounds' Bill, the Chapel Sites' Bill,—are, however disliked by the Church, either intended to redress general grievances, or are steps in the gradual establishment of religious equality between Churchman and Dissenter. But Parliament has a horror of any measure which is purely religious. The House of Lords plays with Lord Shaftesbury's summary proposal to abolish vestments. The House of Commons evaded the question of a Commission for the revision of the Authorized Version. The trade in Prayer-books is at a stand-still, because Mr. Gladstone was reluctant to introduce into Parliament a Bill authorizing the new Lectionary already adopted by Convocation. If Parliament is, in the last resort, the governing body of the Church, it is singularly unwilling to exercise its functions. For a pilot to suffer a ship to drift whither winds and currents may take her, may be a pardonable negligence in calm weather and upon the open sea, but hardly when she is driving upon a lee shore and already in sight of the breakers.

The practical necessities which limit the administration of Church patronage by successive Ministries tend to the same result. The natural impulse of a Minister whose private predilections, if he has any, are held in check by the desire of avoiding ecclesiastical complications, is to seat upon the Episcopal Bench moderate men, not irretrievably committed to any party, and, if possible, men of

judgment and administrative capacity. Experience shews that the tradition of the Bench is so strong, that a man falls into this line of character and action as a Bishop, even if as a clergyman he has shewn little indication of it ; and the safest of Prelates are those who have a reputation for heterodoxy to get rid of. And "safety" is no doubt what the State wants of a Bishop, and for the most part gets ; a dislike of all innovation, even if it assume the specious disguise of reform ; a personal avoidance of the eccentric and the extreme ; a reputable orthodoxy of teaching ; an industrious attendance to details of diocesan work ;—qualities, all of them, which are useful in doing the daily work of the Church, and in postponing till to-morrow its perplexing problems. But they are hardly the qualities which a Church torn in pieces by internal dissension, and compelled at the same time to fight the battle of faith against an unbelieving philosophy, asks of its leaders. Were not the picture too severely ironical, we might make a sketch of such a Bench of Bishops as should find their natural place in the van of all religious thought and all philanthropic work in this country, the instructors of the instructed, and the captains of the zealous. But to put that fancy by, does any party within the Church at the present moment own Episcopal leadership? One of the strangest manifestations of Ritualism—an openly sacerdotal party—is its avowed dislike and almost contempt of the rulers who, if nominated by the State, are at least placed by their consecration in the mysterious line of apostolical succession. And while the Ritualists complain of hard and arbitrary treatment from the Bishops, the Evangelical party, on the other hand, are loud in their dissatisfaction with leaders who do not lead, and governors who are too timid to govern. Or if it be thought that the double reproach really answers itself, and that the policy which is arraigned from both sides must be moderate and just, look at the dead-lock to which the whole machine of Church and State is reduced, so far as its ecclesiastical part is concerned. Whatever changes of dogma or of ritual one party ardently desires, the other as ardently repudiates. The portions of the Prayer Book which the Evangelicals would modify or expunge, are the portions on which the High-churchmen set the greatest store. The ritual innovations which the Ritualists regard

as bringing them a little nearer to the ideal of worship, are denounced by the Evangelicals as a paltry and treasonable imitation of Rome. The whole situation is summed up with absolute and melancholy accuracy in the recent Report of the Royal Commission on Ritual. It was fairly composed of distinguished men, chosen from every party in the Church, who were bidden, in entire independence of all ecclesiastical and political combinations, to make a minute inquiry into the subject, and to report for the guidance of Parliament. They have lingered long over their work, and at last have recommended—practically nothing! They have appended a note to the Athanasian Creed, which hurts some consciences that were before at ease, and eases none that were before hurt. They have made a few trifling recommendations, which do not touch a single point where dispute was loud and sore. And even from this Report—nugatory as it is—more than half the Commissioners dissent on various grounds; so as to provoke the suspicion that, in order to pass something, the majority gave way to the minority. The number of Commissioners actually sitting was twenty-seven; twenty-six protests, signed by fifty-eight names, are added to the body of the Report. If such is the outcome of deliberations of eminent men sitting round a table and discussing difficulties in the friendly atmosphere of a Committee, what would be the probable result of eager Parliamentary debates, and what Ministry would take the responsibility of measures likely to arouse them?

But supposing—a somewhat hard supposition!—that the present indifference of statesmen to ecclesiastical questions were replaced by a judicious interest, and that all that political ability could do were directed to maintaining the Church upon a basis not less comprehensive than the present, what chance is there that the now discordant parties could be persuaded to live in peace together? Dean Stanley says in his Preface:*

"We often hear it said, that the co-existence of the various schools which are now developed with such strength within the English Church, is an inevitable sign of approaching disruption. That it would be exceedingly difficult for the Church of England to maintain its cohesion, with such divergent elements in its

---

* P. xi.

midst, were its present legal constitution to be materially altered, is indeed more than probable. If it were to cease to exist as a national institution, it would almost certainly cease to exist altogether. The centrifugal forces would then become as strong as are now the centripetal, and the different fragments would have no closer connection with each other than the other English religious communities. But so long as the national bond, which, of all outward bonds, ought to be the strongest, continues unbroken, there is no reason why the divergences which it includes should of themselves rend it asunder. And the multiform character of the English Church, its connection with the complex development of English society and English institutions, is certainly no new peculiarity in its history. It is truly observed by a candid and learned Nonconformist historian of the Church under the Commonwealth and the Restoration, that 'although legal questions touching Church matters were not raised in the 17th century as at present, yet the same radical differences existed between one section and another, then as now.'

"I do not underrate the danger to which such an institution is exposed from the hostile attitude of opposing forces, united in this alone. But its chief danger arises from the faintheartedness which regards an imperilled cause as hopelessly lost. If the objections to the national character of a Church, and, I may add, to the possibility of a higher and more common Christianity, are now urged with more than usual vehemence, the advantages of both have been urged with more than usual ability; and difficult as it may be to parry the attacks of powerful combinations against any part of so elaborate a mechanism as the English Constitution, or against an idea, at once so elevated and so practical, as Religion in its freer and purer aspect, I cannot consent to think so unworthily of our leading statesmen, as to believe that they will, from the mere pressure of a fanaticism which they do not share, surrender instruments of good so powerful as the Established Churches, whether of England or Scotland, have proved themselves to be, and may still more prove themselves in time to come. 'Difficile negotium, propter studia partium, gliscentibus in dies odiis inflammata: sed tantis viris nihil dignum nisi quod difficile, nisi quod ab aliis omnibus desperatum.'"

Now we may grant that Dean Stanley is perfectly right in the expectation that if the Church of England were released from its subjection to the State, it would very soon separate into "different fragments," having "no closer connection with each other than the other English religious communities." No one looks for any other result; though

it is possible enough that each of the fragments might exercise a "centripetal force" upon bodies which hold themselves persistently aloof from the Church as it is. And if it is true that the "national bond" is the strongest chain in the link which now holds in one the contending forces in the Church, we are tempted to ask, whose interest is it to maintain it? No doubt it is supported by an immense weight of inertia, which will not be soon or easily overcome; Churchmen, clerical and lay (but especially the former), will be driven only by dire necessity of conscience into a position which must involve a large sacrifice of social prestige and influence; all who, with minds not keenly alive to speculative interests, think more of occasions of practical usefulness than of a logical position, will bitterly resent what will seem to them the impetuosity of partizans; and none, inside the Church or out, who are not bitten by the fanaticism of Nonconformity, could help lamenting the final abandonment, as impossible, of that ideal of a National Church which is the noblest external embodiment of religion. But the question is, will these considerations always prevail against the disruptive forces which the logical development of conflicting theories, and the fresh fire of religious passion which it has kindled, have generated within the Church? And when these things come, as they must, if the present situation continues or becomes more difficult, under the consideration of Parliament; and Church questions, with their peculiar power of exciting animosity and inflaming anger, are found to destroy party combinations, and to divide Cabinets by an unexpected line; to make friends of political foes, and foes of political friends; and, with all this, to stand in the way of needful and beneficent legislation for the nation at large;—will not any Prime Minister, who is more of a Statesman than a Churchman, be tempted to cut the knot by adopting the *ultima ratio* of disestablishment, and remitting the Church's quarrels to be settled in the Church's synods? But when that consummation comes, it will not be in consequence, as Dr. Stanley seems to think, of "powerful combinations" on the outside. We believe that the operations of the "Liberation Society," so far from having aided the disintegration of the Church of England, have rather retarded it. The catastrophe will ensue at last, because no compromise made in the 16th

century can by any artifice continue to be valid in the 19th; because the forms of faith which now claim to be comprehended in the National Church, if it is to exist at all, have long outgrown the creeds and formularies upon which that Church is based.

There are two active tendencies of thought in the Church at the present moment, one towards Authority, the other towards Liberty; one towards a sacramental and sacerdotal, the other towards a reasonable and scientific, form of theological belief. Between the parties which manifest these tendencies stands the Evangelical centre, not thinking at all, and therefore, in an age of active speculation, being gradually weakened by secessions in either direction. Of the feeling of the High-church party towards the connection between Church and State, we have already sufficiently spoken; they are learning to hate and despise it more bitterly every day. What of the Broad-churchmen? So far they may be generally described as having held Dean Stanley's theory; to them the interpretation of the Church's formularies by the courts of law has been exceptionally favourable; and by a process of logic, the moral sincerity of which we respect, but which we do not profess to be able to understand, they have persuaded themselves that they are justified in habitually using the Book of Common Prayer in public worship. But it is a fact, to which Dean Stanley calls attention more than once, that the questions recently decided in a liberal sense by the Church courts, have been chiefly such as concerned the authority of Scripture,—questions as to which the Articles give no deliverance, because at the time when the Church was settled upon its present basis they had never arisen. But when doctrinal matters have been in dispute, the result has been very different. Mr. Heath was deprived, not, as Dean Stanley epigrammatically puts it, because he was deaf, but because he had ventured upon some very harmless, though not orthodox, speculations upon the Atonement. The counts of their indictment (to borrow a metaphor from the criminal law) on which Dr. Lushington did *not* acquit Dr. Williams and Mr. Wilson were doctrinal; and although they just escaped condemnation by the Privy Council, we venture to doubt whether it would be safe for any clergyman to deny *totidem verbis* the doctrine of eternal punishment—which

Mr. Wilson certainly did not—if any zealous accuser were at hand. The long-lingering prosecution which has been so hard upon Mr. Voysey will not have issued in a sentence when these pages are published; but there seems no doubt that, when that sentence is pronounced, it will be entirely adverse to his continuance in the Church. But the question for the liberal party in the Church is far less of past collisions with the courts than of those which are to come. Can any one imagine that the changes which have already taken place in the religious opinions of educated men are anything more than a preparation and foreshadowing of far greater changes which are impending? Is theology the only science which is to undergo neither modification nor advance under the impulse of modern thought? The habit of looking at the Scriptures from a new point of view will inevitably lead to a revised estimate of their contents; the growth of so-called Christian doctrine during the first ages is an historical conception, at once resting upon sure ground of fact and pregnant of consequences; the ascertained results of science in regard to the age of the world and the extent of the universe, introduce a new proportion between the episode of revelation and redemption and the whole will of God; and, in the last place, Religion will hold her own against modern methods of philosophical thought, only by help of many and grave changes of position. And all this means, in brief, that heresy in the Church of England is about to pass from the critical into the doctrinal phase. It will become increasingly difficult for educated and thoughtful men to use the Book of Common Prayer in public worship (and this, not subscription to the Articles, is the crucial point) with the necessary consciousness of sincerity. Many such men at Oxford and Cambridge, who came up to the University intending to take orders, are evading the difficulty by turning aside to other professions, and the Church is left to the service of clergymen whose names have never appeared on the class list; many more, who have taken the irrevocable step, have abandoned the exercise of ministerial functions, and strive to hide themselves in the ranks of the protesting laity. But this is only prolonging the Church's life at the cost of sapping her vitality; she must fight out the battle with unbelief, and will fight at a terrible disadvantage if she goes down into the battle encumbered with

the crude and unscientific theology of the Reformation. For our own part, we believe that liberal thinkers in the Church are satisfied with its present basis, and with what liberty they practically enjoy within its pale, simply because they do not yet know whither their principles are leading them; and we are much mistaken if the reflection of a few more years, helped by the simultaneous development of sacerdotal religion by their side, does not teach them that the unreformed Church of England, taken at its freest, is not free enough for them.

Dean Stanley's thesis appears to be, that the Church *as it is* is wide enough for all practical purposes, and that the character of compromise impressed upon it by the struggles of Elizabeth's reign and the personal character of that singular woman, has made it as comprehensive as a Church needs to be. It is true that he arrives at this conclusion by help of a very lax interpretation of what is meant by agreement with the formularies. Nobody, indeed, in the Church does agree with them, and the more and the less of difference is a matter, we suppose, for each man's conscience and the Court of Arches. "Let him who agrees with every word and statement of the formularies," says Dr. Stanley, speaking of some incriminated propositions of "Essays and Reviews," "cast the first stone at these variations. All clergymen, of whatever school, who have the slightest knowledge of their own opinions, and of the letter of the Prayer Book and Articles, must go out one by one, beginning at the Archbishop of Canterbury in his palace at Lambeth, even down to the humblest curate in the wilds of Cumberland."* We are afraid that we fail to recognize in this state of things the ideal organization of a Christian Church. If a Church is to be built up on the foundation of dogmatic belief at all, let the confession of faith be made as clear, inclusive and simple as may be; but let it at least be honestly accepted and strictly enforced. In our view, another alternative, not yet tried on any great scale, is also possible, and also logical,—that of a Church without a creed, whose members should be left to make their own arrangements for public worship, and in which the consciousness of a common relation to God and Christ should be felt to

---

* P. 89.

be a sufficient basis for work and affection. Either of these is intelligible: what is not intelligible is, that men should defend as a permanent institution, incapable of improvement, a Church where large and complex formularies hang loosely upon every neck, and a lax interpretation of definite obligations is held to be the true ground of freedom. And why, in the name of all history, is the permanent rule of the Church to be sought in the 16th century? Why is that settlement of many fierce political and religious debates—a settlement determined by no very lofty motives, and influenced by many personal accidents—never more to be disturbed? Are we then mistaken in supposing that the learning of that age was crude and imperfect, that the Reformation was only a partial revolt against the corruptions of Christianity, and that human thought, with vision newly purged from mediæval darkness, saw nothing clearly, but only, as it were, "men as trees walking"? We do not hesitate to say that, if we are to stop short of the freest exercise of the trained faculties of this present age upon the materials afforded by the Scriptures and the whole subsequent history of the Church, it would be infinitely more logical to accept the teaching of that older Communion, which can at all events trace its pedigree up to the first Christian centuries. Not the least convincing proof of the wisdom of the Founder of Christianity may be seen in the fact, that he left his Church without any organization, free to adapt itself to the varying needs of successive generations; but it must be the very ingenuity of sophistry that would persuade us that Elizabeth's Bishops, cringing before her imperious will, and chiefly anxious to keep their own seats, which Catholic reaction here, and Puritan zealotry there, were threatening to overturn, had hit upon a rule of faith so prophetic in its adaptation to the needs of the Church, that three hundred years after its adoption it might be justifiably quoted as at once the safeguard of Catholic truth and the guarantee of all reasonable liberty.

It is quite true, as Dean Stanley desires us to note, that the existence of diverse tendencies of thought in the English Church is no new thing, but has been its characteristic from the first. Does he forget that once already in its history the struggle has ended in ruin, and once in schism; that Laud died upon the scaffold, the martyr of a dying Church,

and that Sancroft lingered out his days in obscurity, the hierarch of a neglected sect? And the third development of sacerdotalism in the Church is, from the theological point of view, more logical and more complete than either of the two that have preceded it, because it has been made in full view of a development of Rationalism, of which it feels itself the natural and irreconcilable foe. Nor to that development, which tends ever more completely to bring religion to the same tests of human reason as every other form of knowledge, is it possible to place any effectual hindrance or delay. It is a part of the great wave of thought which, beginning from the revival of letters, first shewed its force in the Reformation, and now, having gathered strength from the achievements of rejuvenescent science, again with victorious flood sweeps in upon the Church. What orthodox men call scepticism, infidelity, atheism, and many hard names more, but which some who are supposed to be its victims know well to be compatible with the deepest faith and the humblest piety,—the spirit of the new time,—is in the books we read, the institutions under which we live, the social efforts that we make, the talk about our hearths, the very air we breathe. It affects even orthodox churches without their knowledge and against their will; the old doctrines are re-stated in a milder form, and the severity of discipline is melting away. And against this powerful and insidious influence there is but one hopeful bulwark (so at least it seems to men who stand upon the old ways), the principle of Authority, embodied in a sacerdotal Church, administering a sacramental system. The contrast is sharp, the contradiction logical: here, the inquirer, compassing sea and land with eager mind to seek out truth; there, the believer, meekly receiving the teaching of a Church that cannot err: here, the soul face to face with God, no advocate or mediator between; there, a priesthood permanently standing between the suppliant and Christ: here, the spirit fed by personal communion with the Infinite; there, an administration of grace by bread and wine and oil and sacred rites. For these extremes no middle point of meeting can possibly be found; the principle of Freedom and the principle of Authority, consciously pushed to their logical consequences, are mutually exclusive. Let who will, believe that they can long live together in a

Church which gives ambiguous encouragement to both, and affords a fair standing-ground for neither.

It will be observed that in the foregoing remarks we have neither advanced any theory as to the connection of Church and State, nor expressed any opinion as to the organization of religion which may in the abstract be considered most desirable. Our sole object has been to estimate the present situation, and to forecast the way in which existing and active forces are likely to modify it. To us, indeed, the question of Church and State seems quite to have passed out of the theoretical into the practical stage: thoughtful men no longer ask themselves, "what is abstractedly best?" but, "what will happen," and "how soon?" There was perhaps a time, before opposing tendencies had been developed to the extremes in which they now defy all reconciliation, when a wise and generous attempt to base the comprehensiveness of the Church upon a logical foundation and at the same time to increase its scope, might have prevented the shock to which it is now hastening; but the policy of letting the Church drift was deliberately preferred by statesmen, and the ship is all but upon the rocks. Now, even if, against all likelihood, we could hope for a change of purpose, it is too late to prevent the catastrophe. The principle of disestablishment has been admitted in the instance of the Irish Church; and though in many important particulars the cases differ, no ground of principle can be urged against its application to the Church of England also. The existence of irreconcilable schools of religious thought within the Church has done much; the unwillingness of statesmen to face ecclesiastical questions will do the rest. Only, if it be possible, let the severance be accomplished, not only justly, but generously; not only with the solemnity appropriate to so great a change, but with a patriotic regret that it should be needful. Let it be clear how the National Church falls—not by attacks from without, which it might easily have been strengthened to withstand, but by internal weakness and dissension.

> Suis et ipsa Roma viribus ruit
> Quam neque finitimi valuerunt perdere Marsi,
> Minacis aut Etrusca Porsenæ manus.

Nor let its downfall, which for its sons will be very hard

to bear, be embittered by a shout of triumphant animosity, too surely fruitful of future suspicion and hatred, but rather softened by a kindly regret that so high a purpose as a national organization of religion should be found incapable of realization, and that we have to struggle once more, through a period of more consistent individualism, to the time when Englishmen will learn the possibility of religious union upon the basis of trusts and affections which lie deeper than any dogmas.

For much of what has been said of the superior freedom which has been hitherto enjoyed within the Church, is undeniably true. It is by members of her communion, especially of late years, that the greatest services have been rendered to theological inquiry. Her courts of law have dealt with heresy more mildly than either Methodist Conferences or Presbyterian Synods. The very variety of her public opinion has afforded a moral support to heretics, which they are very far from receiving among Independents or Baptists. And it is only too probable that the division into sects which will follow upon disestablishment, may for a time circumscribe this liberty, by organizing men of fixed opinions round separate centres, and leaving the more thoughtful and less dogmatic to frame a Church fellowship for themselves. But even this will not be without its compensation. It is impossible to say how many minds will cease to work in fetters, or how many tongues will be unloosed, by the removal of restrictions which press most heavily upon tender consciences and sensitive natures; and if Churches of creed-bound men are formed, rigid in outline and strict in discipline, it will be an inestimable advantage that over against them should spring to life a Church of the truly Free, whose liberty should not depend upon the accidental omissions of articles, the unintentional width of liturgies, the fortuitous liberality of law courts, but upon principles which its members have deliberately adopted as the basis of their ecclesiastical existence. And even in regard to Churches with whom orthodoxy is the first thing, we believe that through an absolute sincerity to conviction is the only way to a desirable freedom. The liberty which rests only on the evasion of obligations is not worth having by any Christian man. It can have no other end than to become a snare and a weakness to a

Church; and if it is enforced by the heavy hand of the State upon those who do not want it, is felt meanwhile to be an intolerable bondage. Presently, though the time may yet be far off, the dawn of a true Freedom will redden the East, when Christian believers who form and utter their own convictions with unflinching faithfulness shall have fully learned the great truth, that the ground of religious fellowship among men cannot be narrower than that of men's acceptance with God; and that what He asks of all is only the consecration of the will and the devotion of the heart.

CHARLES BEARD.

V.—THE PARSEES.

Essay on the Pahlavî Language. By Martin Haug, Ph.D. Stuttgart. 1870.

THIS Essay by the Professor of Sanscrit and Comparative Philology at the University of Munich brings to the recollection of its readers his earlier volume of 'Essays on the Sacred Language, Writings and Religion of the Parsees,' published at Bombay in 1862, when he filled the Sanscrit chair in the College of Poonah. This latter work (now out of print) was brought out, as its list of subscribers shews, mainly at the expense of Parsees. The former is prefixed to a Pahlavî-Pazand Glossary, jointly edited by Dr. Haug and a Parsee Destur (High-priest), which the Bombay Government, much to their credit, have had published at their own cost for the benefit of their Parsee subjects in western India. While, therefore, neither book can be said to have been addressed to an English public at home, the republication of the first in a separate form, and, though at Stuttgart, in the English language, may be fairly taken to be one more added to other indications of an awakening turn of interest in the English mind towards the Zoroastrian languages and literature. That English scholarship should have done so little in the direction of elucidating these subjects is all the more wonderful, considering that the

Danish, German and French scholars to whom Europe is indebted for any knowledge she has of the two languages in which the Zoroastrian Scriptures have come down, would, so far at least as respects the elder of the two, have found their task a hopeless one had they not been helped by previous English researches into a sister-language—Sanscrit.

When the officers of the English East-India Company extended their authority over the provinces now forming the Presidency of Bombay, a separated and singular people were living among the Hindoos—a people who ever since have proved faithful and zealous adherents of the British rule.[1] With some features of physical likeness to the people of the country, half suggesting a common origin, the Parsees yet differ from those around them in so many respects, mental as well as physical, as to prove that if the two races were ever one, that period of identity must have been succeeded by ages of separation. Their traditions lead back to a Persian ancestry—to the time when the Sassanian dynasty fell before the advance of the Arabs, and the Zoroastrian religion was forcibly supplanted by Mahometanism. They say that a persecuted remnant of believers then fled to the mountainous districts of Khorassan; some descendants of whom, after the lapse of about one hundred years, found their way to the island of Ormuz at the mouth of the Persian Gulf, then a centre of trade and navigation; and thence, along the coast of Beloochistan, to India. The earliest traces of them in India point to the island of Dïú (now Portuguese), off the coast of Guzarát, as their first landing-place. They are next found at Sanján on the mainland, some miles south of the present Portuguese possession of Damán. Here they remained in peace for several centuries, favoured by the Hindoo Rajahs, and able to keep their 'sacred fire' alive; until driven out by Mahometan invaders, against whom they had given efficient military assistance to the reigning Rajah. Dispersed among the neighbouring districts, they seem to have been able to make up their quarrel with the Mahometans; for we find them acquiring wealth and influence, and even employed

[1] See "The British Raj contrasted with its Predecessors," by Dosabhoy Framjee. London and Bombay, 1858.

by the Nawabs of Surat in minor offices of state.[2] Their numbers, which there is some reason to believe were added to by successive emigrations from Persia, continued to increase; and then, as now, they were remarkable for industry and money-making skill. After Bombay became an appanage of the English Crown in 1668 as part of the dowry of Catherine of Portugal, large accessions to its population were made from among the Parsees of Surat.

The common speech of this people has from time immemorial been the vernacular of the country in which they dwell. But for at least two centuries past they have been known to possess manuscripts of their sacred writings in two distinct dead languages, some of the written characters of which are identical. These languages were said to be little understood even by Parsees, and it was certain that they were not at all understood by Europeans.

In the year 1723,[3] the University of Oxford acquired one of these manuscripts, sent home from Surat. Unfortunately no Oxford man could decipher it. Nothing could be more tantalizing. The spiritual and moral superiority of the Zoroastrian religion to any other pre-Christian system except Judaism was already well known; and its relations, not to Judaism only, but even to Christianity, were beginning to be understood and acknowledged. The book was believed to shut up hidden treasures of thought and philosophy. The picture of it lying on a Bodleian table, and handled curiously, but wonderingly and tenderly, by surrounding professors and scholars, is forcibly suggestive of one of Dean Swift's best remembered scenes.

Thirty years more of unwilling ignorance had passed by, when, in 1754, a fac-simile of four pages of this same MS. caught the eye of a young French divinity student, an enthusiast for eastern learning. The name of Abraham Hyacinthe Anquetil du Perron is thenceforward inseparably connected with the history of the study of the Zoroastrian languages. He resolved to find out the contents of the book. Yet the language in which it was written could be

---

[2] The Parsees; by Dosabhoy Framjee. London and Bombay, 1858.

[3] This is the date given by Anquetil, and adopted by Dr. Murray Mitchell in a Lecture on 'The Parsees and the Zend-Avesta,' delivered at Calcutta in April last (Bombay Gazette, August 2, 1870). Other MSS. had previously been brought to England in the 17th century, but only as matters of curiosity.

learnt only from the eastern people of whose religion the book was supposed to be a record. It has been too much the fashion to exaggerate the sacrifices which Anquetil made and the difficulties and hardships which he encountered in carrying out his project. It was necessary to get out to India. He was poor, and his family were too poor to help him. He had literary friends, with influence in high places, who were willing to interest themselves for him. But his impatience refused to wait; and he enrolled himself as a common soldier in the service of the French East-India Company, in a regiment bound for Pondicherry. It is hard to understand how he proposed to become released from this engagement after his arrival at Pondicherry in order to prosecute Zoroastrian studies; or how, in any case, without money or friends in Hindostan, he could expect to find his way from Pondicherry to Surat. He was fortunate, however, in having friends at home more considerate for him than he was for himself.

Anquetil's autobiographical introduction to his book is a fascinating volume of travels. Almost a boy in years, and quite a boy in frankness and freshness of spirit, his narrative interests a reader nearly as much as his graces of person appear, from his own naïve and half-unconscious disclosures, to have interested most of the people amongst whom he fell. Soon after his arrival at L'Orient (the port at which his regiment was to embark), it was intimated to him that the Government had favourably considered the case made out for him by his Paris friends; that he was discharged from the army; that a free cabin passage to Pondicherry was granted to him in one of the East-India Company's ships; and that a pension of 500 livres was conferred upon him by the king. He sailed in February, 1755. Including the then usual long delays at intermediate ports, the voyage occupied six months. Its so-called hardships were not greater than the wealthiest European passenger to India must needs have submitted to a hundred years ago.

Arrived at Pondicherry, the Governor-General increased Anquetil's pension to 1900 livres. Two years were wasted, as he himself in the most open way confesses, among the temptations and distractions of colonial hospitalities and pleasures. Finally, having made up his mind that it was

necessary to learn Sanscrit before he commenced the study of Zend, he set off for the French settlement of Chandernagore in Bengal. An approaching English army drove him back to Pondicherry. A passage thence to Mahé on the Malabar coast was given him in a French man-of-war. His progress northward was interrupted by a visit to the Malabar Christians (of whom he gives a long account[4]), and by inquiries into the natural history and antiquities of the districts through which he passed. He reached Surat on the 1st May, 1758; more than three years having elapsed since the date of his departure from L'Orient.

Anquetil remained at Surat four years. With something of the wisdom of the serpent, proving that in one sense at least his previous three years' experience had not been wholly thrown away, he succeeded in obtaining information and lessons from two different Parsee Desturs of opposite parties, each jealous of the other. He collected a large number of manuscripts—Zend, Pehlevi, Persian and Indian—which, with all his own rough notes, he afterwards deposited in 1762 in the 'Bibliothèque du Roi' at Paris, where students can still have access to them. With these in his possession, he returned to Europe, with the permission of the Bombay Government, in an English ship. On landing at Portsmouth, he was treated as a prisoner of war; but was allowed, while negociations for his release were in progress, to visit Oxford on parole. Some lingering distrust of the authenticity of his own documents seems to have been dissipated by a comparison of them with the Zend MSS. already at Oxford.

Anquetil's principal work[5] was not published until 1771, nine years after his return. There was reason enough for the disappointment with which it was received, but none

---

[4] Though unconnected with the present subject, we may be permitted to remark (with reference to an article on the Nestorians in a late number of this Review) that Anquetil's description makes it clear that the change in the theological creed of the Syrian Christians of Malabar from Nestorianism to Monophysism had been completely effected before 1758.

[5] "Zend-Avesta, Ouvrage de Zoroastre, contenant les Idées Théologiques, physiques et morales de ce Législateur, les cérémonies du culte religieux qu'il a établi, et plusieurs traits importans relatifs à l'ancienne histoire des Perses: traduits en François sur l'original Zend." Paris, 1771. The work is in two volumes 4to, usually bound in three. A bibliopole may be interested in knowing that it is sometimes to be met with on the shelves of London book-dealers who lay themselves out for oriental literature.

at all for the abuse which was heaped upon its compiler. The philosophers who fell upon Anquetil should have blamed, not him, but their own exaggerated expectations. Supposing that the Zoroastrian books, as presented in Anquetil's translations, did really, as Sir William Jones said, contradict common sense and sound reasoning,—or supposing that, as Kant said, they shewed no trace of philosophical ideas,—these might be good grounds for disputing their authority, but certainly offered no fair logical argument against their authenticity. The arguments brought by philologists against the real existence of the Zend and Pehlevi languages deserved more attention, but have been effectually refuted by later investigations.

These investigations, however, were not begun until some fifty years after the appearance of Anquetil's book. In 1826, the Danish scholar Rask wrote his work 'On the Age and Genuineness of the Zend Language,' applying his knowledge of Sanscrit to the proof of the close affinity of the two. More lately, Eugene Bournouf,[6] Professor of Sanscrit at Paris, detected the real points in which Anquetil had failed. Neither the latter nor his Parsee teachers possessed anything in the shape of grammatical knowledge of the languages. The translator being thus unable to distinguish grammatical forms, his translation is full of inaccuracies. Dr. Haug sums up its character as follows:

"He was a trustworthy man in every respect, and wrote only what he was taught by the Parsee Dustoors. These High-priests of the Parsee community, who are the only preservers of the religious traditions, and their interpreters, derive all information on their religion, not from the original Zend texts themselves, but from the Pehlevi translation made of them at the time of the Sassanids. Considering that even this translation is not quite correct, and besides, that it is not understood by the Dustoors in a critical and philological way, how can Anquetil be expected to have furnished us with an accurate translation? In many instances Anquetil misunderstood the Dustoors also; so that his

---

[6] A lithographed fac-simile of one of the Zend manuscripts deposited by Anquetil in the Bibliothéque du Roi has been published by M. Bournouf in a handsome folio volume of 561 pages. The characters are singularly bold and clear. It is said that only 100 copies were printed, and that the book is consequently scarce.—We have not seen the Zend text of Spiegel.—That of Westergaard is beautifully printed in Zend characters (not fac-simile, being the result of a critical comparison of MSS.) on fine paper.

translation was tinged with errors of three kinds, viz., those of the Pehlevi translations, those of the Dustoors, and those of his own misunderstandings. His work therefore cannot stand the test, and from a critical point of view it cannot be styled even a translation; it is only a summary report, in an extended form, of the contents of the Zend-Avesta. But he cannot be blamed for that; at his time it was quite impossible for the most learned and sagacious scholars to do more than he really did. From the Dustoors he learned the approximate meanings of the words, and starting from this very rudimentary knowledge, he then simply guessed the sense of each sentence."[7]

We have noticed with regret a recent and (to us) entirely fresh accusation against Anquetil. Professor Max Müller, in his 'Lectures on the Science of Language,'[8] says twice that Anquetil's translation of the Zend-Avesta was not made from the original, but from a modern Persian translation. We respectfully wait for evidence of the correctness of the statement. Supposing the fact to be proved, it will be singularly inconsistent with other well-established facts in the case. Anquetil possessed some modern Persian MSS. of works of minor importance; but none, so far as we are able to make out, of the Zend-Avesta, or even of the Vendidad-Sadé alone. If by any of the authorities we have had the opportunity of consulting the existence in either Europe or India of such a manuscript is referred to, we have entirely overlooked it. We hope it may prove that the statement has arisen out of Anquetil's own mention[9] that modern Persian had served him as a 'langue intermédiaire' in receiving his lessons; his teacher, lest his servant should overhear, refusing to disclose the mysteries of his religion in the vulgar tongue.[10]

Competent scholars seem to be now generally agreed on the antiquity of the Zend[11] language—on its purely Aryan

---

[7] Essays, 1862, p. 21.

[8] First series, 2nd edition, pp. 166, 205.

[9] Discours Préliminaire, p. 330.

[10] The contributor of the article "Zend-Avesta" to Brande and Cox's Dictionary, referring to Max Müller, betters the Professor's instruction by stating that "The text of these books was brought to Europe by Anquetil du Perron in the form of a modern Persian translation of the original."

[11] Until competent scholars shall agree on a uniform orthography, amateur learners may be pardoned for continuing to use the spelling best known to English readers. In the interval between the publication of his two books,

character, and on its affinity, and in some respects superiority, to Sanscrit. Dr. Haug distinguishes two dialects: (1) the 'Gâtha dialect,' in which the so-called Gâthas or songs are written; and (2) the 'classical Zend,' in which most of the other books of the Zend-Avesta are written, and which is believed to have been for many centuries the living language of Bactria. Both dialects appear to have died out some centuries B.C., and to have left no daughters. It is only in the Parsee Scriptures that either is extant.

The other ancient Parsee language, Pehlevi,[11] is of far more complicated and difficult character; and the rapid changes of opinion with regard to it are most remarkable. It is a singular compound of Semitic and Aryan (Iranian) elements. Not many years ago, it was suspected that Pehlevi had never been a vernacular language at all, but was a wholly fictitious tongue, invented by the priests as a secret medium for their instructions.[12] This theory abandoned, it was looked upon as an Iranian daughter of Zend, corrupted by contact with the Semitism of Chaldea, but chosen from among several provincial dialects by the Sassanian restorers of Zoroastrianism as the official language of Persia. Later inquiry seemed to indicate that the relation to Zend of the Iranian element in Pehlevi was that of a sister, not of a daughter. Finally, the Essay whose title appears at the head of this article expounds another and still more recondite theory.

Dr. Haug[13] gives reasons for rejecting the common belief that Pehlevi originated in a mixture of Semitic and Iranian elements on the frontiers of Irân and Chaldea in the first or second century A. D., and thence spread gradually over

---

Dr. Haug has changed Zend into Zand, and Pehlevi into Pahlavî. Professor Westergaard uses Zend in one sense and Zand in another. It is said that a European ear cannot distinguish between the pronunciation in Zend or Pehlevi of *a* and *e*, or of *o* and *u*.

[12] This opinion was expressed by Miss Frances Power Cobbe in 1865 in her brilliant historical and critical sketch, 'The Sacred Books of the Zoroastrians' [Studies New and Old of Ethical and Social Subjects. London, 1865. Trübner], which, we have the authority of a learned Parsee for saying, contains the best account yet given of the literature of the disciples of Zoroaster. Its statement that Pehlevi is in part compounded of *Arabic* is probably a slip of pen or press for *Aramaic*; the Semitic element in Pehlevi being in no wise Arabic, though in one dialect it resembles Chaldee.

[13] P. 128.

the whole Persian empire under the Sassanian dynasty, which we condense as follows:

(1.) It is improbable that the Sassanian kings—zealous promoters of Persian ascendency and restorers of the Zoroastrian religion—should adopt as their official language a newly-formed jargon of Semitic and Iranian words and inflections, in which the former element even outweighs the latter. No political or religious reason can be assigned for it.

(2.) The complete disappearance of the Aramaic words of Pehlevi in its successor, the Persian of the time of Firdûsi (A.D. 1000), could not be explained if Pehlevi had been a frontier language. Foreign words once naturalized and employed in standard works of literature for the most part never disappear, but henceforth remain a part of the language.

(3.) The whole character of Pehlevi is opposed to the supposition that it was a frontier language of the first or second century.[14]

(4.) Two Pehlevi dialects (called by Dr. Haug Chaldæo-Pahlavî and Sassanian-Pahlavî), similar in character, were used in the earlier Sassanian inscriptions; precluding the supposition that Pehlevi was a frontier language of the first or second century.

Dr. Haug's own explanation is that the origin of this language must be sought for during the period of the Assyrian rule over Irân, which was established at least as early as the 12th century B.C., and lasted 520 years, and that it remained a recognized language long after the downfall of the Assyrian empire. His reasoning in favour of this theory is conclusive to our own mind, but so recondite that we must refer the reader who may wish to examine it to the book itself. He seems to us to have satisfactorily traced the Semitic dialect of Pehlevi back to the 7th century B.C., and to have identified it with that form of the Assyrian language which was in all probability spoken at Nineveh, and written in the so-called Phœnician character.

One curious matter connected with this Pehlevi language must not be left unnoticed. We have already spoken of its preponderating Semitic element. It is a remarkable fact

---

[14] Pp. 120—128.

that when the Parsees in reading Pehlevi come to a Semitic word, they pronounce, not the written Semitic word, *but its Iranian equivalent.* And as though to remind the reader to make the change, an Iranian suffix is added to the Semitic word. For example, the Pehlevi written words *abîtar*, father, and *amîtar*, mother, are pronounced *patar* and *matar* respectively; the Iranian pronunciation being indicated in each case by the addition of the syllable *tar* to the Semitic word.[15] We may illustrate this very roughly by supposing that some one is reading modern composite English to an audience who he knows will understand none but words of Teutonic etymology. He comes to the word *felicity* and reads it *happiness.* And to complete the parallel, we may further suppose that it has become usual to add the Saxon suffix *ness* to the Latin word, and to write it *felicityness.*

The question now arises—can this strange fact, that Semitic words were written, but Iranian ones pronounced, be reasonably explained by analogy? Dr. Haug answers in the affirmative.[16] The same fact existed in connection with the Assyrians; who for example wrote *ud-shi* but read *shamshi.* If the character whose phonetic value was *ud* meant 'sun,' the Assyrians pronounced it *shamshi*, which was their name for the sun, and the syllabic character for *shi* was added to it to prevent its being read in any other way.

Whatever be the origin and age of these old sacred languages, it is a lamentable fact that, with a comparatively small number of eminent exceptions, the present generation of Parsees are utterly ignorant of them. The priests as a body are uneducated; and their principal duty consists in reciting prescribed prayers on various religious occasions; all in the Zend language, of which they do not understand a word. The priesthood is hereditary: it is reported, however, that many of the present race of functionaries are unwilling to bring up their sons to their own profession. The Zend-Avesta has lately been translated into the vernacular

---

[15] P. 122.

[16] P. 121. It will be readily conceived how easily under the circumstances described the foreign Semitic (though preponderating) element could be cast out, and the language again become purely Iranian, as we have already said that it was in A.D. 1000.

(Guzaráti), but the translation is described as imperfect and confused. Little care is taken to instruct the young in Zoroastrian doctrine. Professor Dadabhai Naoroji[17] gives a translation of a catechism in Guzaráti appended to the Khordeh-Avestá, which he considers to give a sufficiently accurate outline of the present belief of the orthodox body. The following is an attempt at an abstract of the principal contents of this catechism:

"(1.) We believe in one only God, the Creator of all things, having neither face nor form, colour nor shape, nor fixed place, of glory indescribable, incomprehensible.

"(2.) God is named Hormuzd (highest of spirits), and has many other names, expressive of his nature and good doings.

"(3.) God's true prophet Zurthost (Zoroaster) brought our religion from God.

"(4.) We should worship the holy, just Hormuzd with our face towards some of his creations of light and glory and brightness. Such things are the sun, the moon, the stars, the fire, water and other such glorious things.

"(5.) The commands of God through his prophet are: To know God as one; to know Zurthost as his true prophet; to believe the religion and the Avestá brought by him as true beyond doubt; to believe in the goodness of God; not to disobey any of the commands of our religion; to avoid evil deeds; to endeavour after good deeds; to pray five times in the day; to believe in the judgment on the fourth morning after death; to hope for heaven and to fear hell; to consider certain the day of general destruction and resurrection; to remember always that God has done and will do according to his will; to face some luminous object while worshiping God.

"(6.) Our prophet will not save us if we commit sin. He has distinctly commanded, 'You shall receive according to what you do.' Your deeds will determine your reward in the other world. Heaven is the reward of virtuous and pious actions. Hell is the punishment of sin and wicked deeds. None but God can save you from the consequences of your sins. If any one commit a sin believing he shall

---

[17] The Parsee Religion.—Manners and Customs of the Parsees. London, 1862.

be saved by somebody, deceiver and deceived shall be damned to the day of the end of this world. If you repent your sins and reform, and the great Judge considers you worthy of pardon, or would be merciful to you, He alone can and will save you.

"(7.) The things by which man is blessed and benefited are: To do virtuous deeds, to give in charity, to be kind, to be humble, to speak sweet words, to wish good to others, to have a clear heart, to acquire learning, to speak the truth, to suppress anger, to be patient and contented, to be friendly, to feel shame, to pay due respect to old and young, to be pious, to respect parents and teachers.

"(8.) The things by which man is lost and degraded are: To tell untruths, to steal, to gamble, to look with wicked eye upon a woman, to be treacherous, abusive or angry, to wish ill to another, to be proud, to mock, to be idle, to slander, to be avaricious, disrespectful, shameless or hot-tempered, to take another's property, to be revengeful, unclean, obstinate, envious, to do harm to any man, to be superstitious, to do any other wicked action."

The dualism, theological or philosophical, of some of the later Zoroastrian books seems to be well-nigh forgotten by the prophet's modern disciples; who, at all events, no longer disturb themselves with questions about the origin of evil. Ahrimán has almost slipped out of their theological system; and evil spirits are thought of chiefly with a wish for either their reformation or destruction. The struggle between dualism and monotheism evolved at some period of Zoroastrian history the doctrine of an Eternal Creator of Ormuzd and Ahrimán, a doctrine which has no foundation in the Zoroastrian books. It is a curious fact that the Parsee priests of to-day appeal to a notable mistranslation of Anquetil's in support of this doctrine.

Miss Cobbe says of their religious ceremonies:

"The customs of the Parsees are singular, but not in any degree offensive or immoral like those of the Hindoos. The services of their fire temples are solemn and harmless, if they have become unmeaning. The ceremonies of purification, if extravagant, and, to our thinking, rather tending against cleanliness and delicacy than in their favour, are at least no worse than those of other Eastern nations, and are also rapidly falling into desuetude. Their practice of placing the dead in Towers of

Silence apart from their cities, where the birds of prey devour the corpses in a few hours, and remove all chance of noxious effluvia, may be defended on more grounds than one. Too early marriages and too close intermarriages seem to be the chief errors among their practices; and these are rapidly giving way before the influence of English ideas, to which the Parsees, more than any other people, shew themselves accessible."[18]

The 'influence of English ideas' is working a great change among the Bombay Parsees. It has already divided them into two classes, the 'old' and the 'young.' Professor Dadabhai Naoroji tells us that late struggles between the two have made this distinction marked and expressive. It is evident that within a generation or two their ceremonial practices will be abolished, so far at least as utility condemns them; and that their social customs will be assimilated to those of the English. The 'young' party have for years past vigorously taken up the cause of education; and it is an encouraging fact that the whole community may be said to be agreed on the necessity for the education of females.

The internal affairs of the community were formerly managed by a 'punchayet' or committee chosen from among themselves. This body, however, gradually lost its power; and now, we believe, performs no other duty than the trusteeship of certain charitable funds. As in the case of Mahometans and Hindoos, the British Courts are ready to administer justice to the Parsee community according to its own customs and rules. The difficulty was to determine what these customs were. In 1855, a code of laws for their regulation was agreed upon, under the authority of a public meeting of Parsees, and embodied in a Draft Act for the adoption of the whole community. The Act was afterwards confirmed, and is now enforced by the British Courts.

Much of the commercial prosperity of Bombay has been due to the Parsees. They have been prime movers in the establishment of banks and other joint-stock companies; have shared largely in the introduction of railways; and

---

[18] Studies, p. 108. Perhaps the only allusion in the Old Testament to any religious tenet of the Zoroastrians is that in Ezekiel viii. 16, 17.—To this day the Parsees may be seen praying with face turned to the sun and a bundle of twigs held to the face.

are considerable land-holders and ship-owners. They are always extensively engaged in the cotton trade; and, it may be feared, have felt its reverses.

One most interesting fact, which must not be overlooked, is the kindly feeling of the well-to-do Parsees of Bombay towards their poor and persecuted co-religionists still left in Persia. The 'Guebres' of eastern Persia appear to be nearly confined to the two cities of Yezd and Kirman and the villages in their immediate neighbourhood. In 1813, Kinneir described the city of Yezd as large and populous; a place of considerable trade, being a grand mart between Persia, Bokhara and Hindostan; containing 24,000 houses, 4000 of which were occupied by 'Fire-worshipers,' whom he praised as an industrious people. Sir Robert Ker Porter visited them about 1820, and speaks of them as for the most part excellent husbandmen, gardeners and mechanics. Professor Westergaard, in 1843, estimates their numbers as about 1000 familes in Yezd and 100 in Kirman, or about 5500 persons in all. He adds:

"They all lived in poor circumstances, and the books in their possession were, as far I could learn, very few. The overland summary of the Oriental Christian Spectator, Bombay, January 1849, relates that, subsequent to the death of the late Sháh, they have been subject to a persecution of the harshest kind, so that of 500 residing at Kirman many have fled to the mountains in order to preserve their lives; and other accounts of a similar nature have arrived from Yezd."[19]

Mr. Dosabhoy Framjee,[20] writing in 1858, states that the remnant of the Zoroastrian population in Persia had declined from 100,000 a hundred years before, to 7000 at the time when he wrote. The few who can be called rich belong to the trading class, while the great majority are in a state of extreme poverty. It is these people whom the Parsees of Bombay have attempted to relieve, and for the gratuitous education of whose children they are said to have established schools.

It seems that without the help of these Persian Zoroastrians, the Parsees of Hindostan would have entirely lost their sacred books. The latter confess that the copies brought by themselves to India were no longer in existence

---

[19] Zendavesta, Vol. I. Preface, p. 21.

[20] The Parsees, p. 31.

in the 14th century, and that the originals, from which all MSS. extant in India have been derived, were brought from Yezd between the 14th and 18th centuries.

These Guebres of Persia, amounting in number, as has been said, to not more than 7000, and the Parsees of India, variously estimated at from 50,000 to 120,000, are the only known living representatives of the Zoroastrian religion. There is a singular tribe on the confines of Kûrdistan and Mesopotamia, of Iranian language and to all appearance of Iranian race, some of whose tenets appear to have been derived from the Zoroastrian books. No satisfactory explanation has been given of the origin of the 'Yezidîs,' nor even of the etymology of their name. The name is precisely that which would be used to describe natives of Yezd; though we are not aware that any writer has conjectured that the ancestors of the Yezidîs emigrated from Persia. It has been said that they originally came from Arabia; but evidence of the fact is wanting, and the evidence of language is against it. Professor Max Müller says that they are Kûrds; but perhaps judges only from the likeness of the language of the Yezidîs to that of their Kûrdish neighbours. This alone would be inconclusive, because both dialects are corruptions of and may thus have had a common origin in Persian. Still, we are reminded of a story of the forced transplantation of many thousand Kûrds by a Persian monarch to the northern highlands of Khorassan, to serve there as a bulwark against Turkî invaders; and it is conceivable that some of these, partially imbued with Zoroastrianism, may have found their way back to their ancient homes. But when history is at fault, and even tradition silent, conjecture should hold her peace.

One word in conclusion. This sketch has not been lengthened by extracts from the contents of the religious books of the Parsees, simply because that has been well and judiciously done in the little work on the 'Sacred Books of the Zoroastrians' already alluded to. We echo the wish of its authoress that it may yet arouse some scholar competent to the task of translating these books into an English version sufficiently simple and grammatical to allow their merits to be perceived.

W. J. Lamport.

VI.—THE EARLY HISTORY OF MANKIND.

Researches into the Early History of Mankind and the Development of Civilization. By Edward B. Tylor. 2nd Edition. Murray. 1870.

The Origin of Civilization and the Primitive Condition of Man. By Sir John Lubbock, Bart., M.P., F.R.S. 2nd Edition. Longmans, Green and Co. 1870.

"An Aristotle was but the rubbish of an Adam, and Athens but the rudiments of Paradise,"—exclaims Dr. South, in one of those famous sermons distinguished by their peculiar blending of rough witticisms with rhetorical effects. "In his mode of life, in his moral condition, in his intellectual conceptions, Adam was a typical savage,"—is the verdict of Sir John Lubbock in his thoroughly scientific treatise on the Origin of Civilization.

It is a curious illustration of the way in which the investigations of theologians and men of science often start from opposite poles of thought, that the "rubbish" of the "typical savage" of one writer should be the "Aristotle" of another; but between these two conceptions stretches the great gulf which divides contending theories upon the primitive condition of man.

Sir J. Lubbock has mastered almost all existing records of savage life, and yet does not remember a single instance in which a savage is recorded as having shewn any symptoms of remorse; and almost the only case he can call to mind in which a man belonging to one of the lower races has accounted for an act by saying explicitly that it was right, was when Mr. Hunt asked a young Feejean why *he had killed his mother.*

"The Feejeans believe that as they die, such will be their condition in another world; hence their desire to escape extreme infirmity....As soon as a man feels the approach of old age, he notifies to his children that it is time for him to die. If he neglects to do so, the children after a while take the matter into their own hands. A family consultation is held, a day appointed, and the grave dug. The aged person has his choice of being strangled or buried alive. Mr. Hunt gives the following striking description of such a ceremony once witnessed by him. A

young man came to him and invited him to attend his mother's funeral, which was just going to take place. Mr. Hunt accepted the invitation and joined the procession; but surprised to see no corpse, he made inquiries, when the young man pointed out his mother, who was walking along with them as gay and lively as any of those present, and apparently as much pleased. Mr. Hunt expressed his surprise to the young man, and asked him how he could deceive him so much by saying his mother was dead when she was alive and well. He said in reply that they had made her death-feast, and were now going to bury her; that she was old; that his brother and himself thought she had lived long enough, and it was time to bury her, to which she had willingly assented, and they were about it now. He had come to Mr. Hunt to ask his prayers, as they did those of the priest. He added that it was from love for his mother that he had done so; that in consequence of the same love they were now going to bury her, and *that none but themselves could or ought to do such a sacred office.*"*

To refer the tasks of life to certain divine laws, is for any man attempting to be a Christian almost an instinctive action. It is an operation not needing upon each occasion the exercise of a conscious decision. It is the condition under which alone a Christian character can exist. Has our race been educated to this point, from a state in which the sense of duty scarcely extended beyond the justification of a cruel murder, through the painful discipline of long ages; or does Christianity recall the glory from which we fell? No more striking contrast to the worship of the Father "in spirit and in truth" can be found, than the African practice of writing prayers upon a board, washing them off, and either drinking the water for its divine efficacy, or sprinkling it over various objects to improve or protect them. Do our souls respond to the teachings of Jesus Christ because they awaken aspirations inherited from the first created man, but which have been distorted, confused, forgotten; or have we been trained to their reception through superstitions which have groped blindly beyond themselves for light, and constituted necessary stages in the moral and religious development of man? Is Christianity intended to restore a ruin to its original pattern, or to upbuild the Temple of a new Jerusalem?

---

* Pp. 283, 284.

The difficulty of subjecting the problem of the origin of civilization to a purely scientific treatment is proportioned to its necessity.

Science is impossible so long as one theory is esteemed, on à-priori grounds, more religious than another. Civilization can surely have had no origin more divine than the origin consonant with historical facts. The world as we think it *ought* to have been ordered, cannot be opposed (on the ground of the religiousness of the conception) to the world as it has been actually governed by its Maker. In examining the primitive condition of man, we must put aside abstract arguments as to what *we* may esteem to be most completely in harmony with the nobleness of our nature, or to bear the grandest testimony to the power of the Creator, through that faith in God Himself which is larger than confidence in the wisdom of our own speculations, and reverences any ascertained methods of His creative energy, as most clearly revealing the beauty of His holiness and the tenderness of His love.

Serious obstacles to scientific study arise from the fact, that a vast system of dogmatic theology is dependent upon the "fall" of man. Purely religious considerations, however, cannot establish the truth of a fragment of Genesis, any more than they can determine the anatomy of the serpent, or hide from the palæontologist its occurrence as a tertiary fossil. If a specimen of a serpent be disinterred from the London clay, shewing those complex peculiarities of organization by virtue of which it answers the description, "upon thy belly shalt thou go," can it be annihilated as a geological specimen by connecting its anatomical specialities with the temptation of Eve? An appeal to a statement in Genesis cannot furnish an adequate reply to facts collected by Mr. Tylor and Sir John Lubbock, in the same way as it can justify no decision upon the genuineness of a fossil. By such an appeal, the cause is taken to a wrong court, and no judgment can be given.

Admitting for a moment the cause into court, what does the narrative in Genesis imply concerning the primitive condition of man? Adam and Eve were without the knowledge of good and evil, and by yielding to temptation were supposed to become godlike ("And the Lord God said, Behold the man is become as one of us, to know good and

evil"); the "*fall*" was, as the legend runs, a revelation of that moral responsibility, without which, to a nobler faith, there can be no divine manhood. In trying to picture a state of perfection, the early thinker has fallen into the error—natural to those who first felt the burden of the mystery, and beautiful in its childlike simplicity—of imagining there could only have been happiness for man when he neither knew good nor evil, and was delivered alike from the terror of remorse and the pain of sacrifice. Taking the narrative as it stands, man in the Eden garden could have been neither hero nor saint, and was a lower creature in his primitive condition than in his subsequent history.

The scientific study of savages may not only unfold the stages through which our race has passed, but cast light upon many existing thoughts and customs and feelings, and give sure ground of hope for coming days.

"The study of the lower races of men, apart from the direct importance which it possesses in an empire like ours, is of great interest from three points of view. In the first place, the condition and habits of existing savages resemble in many ways, though not in all, those of our ancestors in a period now long gone by; in the second, they illustrate much of what is passing among ourselves, many customs which evidently have no relation to present circumstances, and even some ideas which are rooted in our minds, as fossils are imbedded in the soil; while, thirdly, we can even by means of them penetrate some of that mist which separates the present from the future."*

The researches of Mr. Tylor are of singular interest. While not attempting to explain by a few generalizations the many phases of the history of civilization, he seeks the simple mental laws which underlie the complexities of phenomena, and collects and groups a mass of evidence along certain great lines of argument. The first chapters of the book treat of the various ways in which man utters his thoughts, in gestures, words, pictures and writing, and gesture-language and picture-writing are explained as direct products of the human mind. In a chapter upon "Images and Names," an attempt is made to trace many of the superstitious beliefs and practices of the untaught man to his inability to separate so clearly as we do the external object from the mere thought or idea of it in the mind.

* Origin of Civilization, p. 1.

"Man, in a low state of culture, very commonly believes that between the object and image of it there is a real connexion which does not arise from a mere subjective process in the mind of the observer; and that it is accordingly possible to communicate an impression to the original through the copy. We may follow this erroneous belief up into periods of high civilization, its traces becoming fainter as education advances; and not only is this confusion of subjective and objective relation connected with many of the delusions of idolatry, but even so obscure a subject as magic and sorcery may be brought in great measure into clear daylight by looking at it as evolved from this process of the mind."*

The illustrations of this law are gathered from all quarters of the globe. In Borneo the familiar European practice still exists of bewitching a wax finger of an enemy, whose body is to waste away as the image is gradually melted: the Thibetan lamas send horses flying from the mountain-top in a gale of wind for the relief of worn-out pilgrims who can get no further on their way, the horses being bits of paper, with a horse printed on each, saddled, bridled and galloping at full speed: a Chinese physician, if he does not possess the drug he requires for his patient, will write the prescription on a piece of paper and let the sick man swallow its ashes. Through the fear that the person may be injured through the name,—the object through the image,—savages have an intense aversion to uttering their own, although they will tell each other's names without hesitation.

"The Abipones of South America think it a sin to utter their own names, and when a man was asked his name, he would nudge his neighbour to answer for him; and in like manner, the Feejeans and the Sumatrans are described as looking to a friend to help them out of a difficulty, when this indiscreet question is put to them."†

In other chapters Mr. Tylor examines the stone age, past and present; the progress of man's knowledge of fire, cooking, and vessels; myths of observation; and the geographical distribution of myths; drawing the general conclusion that "an inspection of the geographical distribution of art and knowledge among mankind seems to give some grounds

---

* Tylor, pp. 119, 120. † P. 142.

for the belief that the history of the lower races, as of the higher, is not the history of a course of degeneration, or even of equal oscillations to and fro, but of a movement which, in spite of frequent stops and relapses, has on the whole been forward; that there has been from age to age a growth in man's power over Nature, which no degrading influences have been able permanently to check."* No student of the early history of mankind can dispense with Mr. Tylor's work.

Sir J. Lubbock's "Origin of Civilization," although following many of the same great lines of argument, is an independent book, with individuality of character, and of equal interest. He dwells more largely than Mr. Tylor on the development of morals, religion and law; and we propose in this article to sketch the course of those investigations which are of special interest to the theologian, gathering illustrations from either source.

It is impossible to discuss the primitive condition of man without encountering some of the profoundest questions in ethics and theology. We have no right to impose dogmatic restraints upon those who would treat man as a subject of "natural history," but we are bound to take into account all the elements of the problem to be solved. Civilization is not only the vaguest of terms, but its definition is impossible, since the hope of social arrangements yet to be achieved, and imagined rather than understood, mingles with every phase of its meaning. Definition, the first demand of the student, is the last request science can grant. Instead of attempting to define civilization, it will be wiser to examine the personal characteristics of the highest type of man. Analyzing human nature as it is presented for study in the most civilized forms, we believe it cannot be exhaustively described without noting a certain consciousness of communion with an invisible Lord, and a conviction of difference in the *worth* of actions and the *authority* of motives. The theological tribunal is no court of appeal for a decision upon physical fact, neither is the tribunal of natural history a fitting court of appeal for a decision upon the reality of a religious experience or the grounds of a moral verdict. The doctrine of a Holy Spirit seeking out

---

* P. 193.

the souls of men rests upon another foundation than the evidence that in some conditions man calls evil good, and in others bitterly cries, "Who but He lays waste our homes and kills our wives and cattle?" The historical method by which man may have been gradually led to guide his conduct by moral principles, which continually approximate the more closely among the most divided nations as intelligence is developed, can neither offer an explanation of the precise nature of duty as duty, or decide the worth of the authority it claims.

Any origin of civilization established by facts must be admitted fairly and freely and unreservedly; but no knowledge of the processes of development can overthrow their actual result in the existence of a being upon earth who has religious experiences, to the genuineness of which his whole nature stands pledged, and who, however blindly, seeks to obey an everlasting law.

Sir J. Lubbock gives the following classification of religions:

"Hitherto it has been usual to classify religions according to the nature of the objects worshipped; Fetichism, e.g., being the worship of inanimate objects, Sabæism that of the heavenly bodies. The true test, however, seems to me to be the estimate in which the Deity is held. The first great stages in religious thought may, I think, be regarded as,—

"*Atheism;* understanding by this term not a denial of the existence of a Deity, but an absence of any definite ideas on the subject.

"*Fetichism;* the stage in which man supposes he can force the Deity to comply with his desires.

"*Nature-worship*, or Totemism; in which natural objects, trees, lakes, stones, animals, &c., are worshipped.

"*Shamanism;* in which the superior deities are far more powerful than man, and of a different nature. Their place of abode also is far away, and accessible only to Shamans.

"*Idolatry, or Anthropomorphism;* in which the gods take still more completely the nature of men, being however more powerful. They are still amenable to persuasion; they are a part of nature, and not creators. They are represented by images or idols.

"In the next stage, the Deity is regarded as the author, not merely a part, of nature. He becomes for the first time a really supernatural being.

"The last stage to which I will refer is that in which morality is associated with religion."*

* P. 137.

The use of the term "Atheism" in this classification appears objectionable. No general "understanding" can empty any term of the ideas it properly expresses; and in following an argument, great confusion may result from using a word denoting an absolute negation to indicate simply the absence of definite conceptions. Atheism so thoroughly implies the existence of Theism, coupled with an act of deliberate denial, that many readers, in pronouncing savages to be "Atheists," will fail to realize that vague sense of unseen unrealities which is neither covered by the term "Atheism" nor "Theism," and which can only be understood as we not merely put aside our own doctrinal prepossessions, but endeavour to analyze a state of mind in which dogmatic convictions are themselves impossible.

"The question as to the general existence of religion among men is indeed to a great extent a matter of definition. If the mere sensation of fear, and the recognition that there are probably other beings more powerful than oneself, are sufficient alone to constitute a religion, then we must, I think, admit that religion is general to the human race. But when a child dreads the darkness and shrinks from a lightless room, we never regard that as an evidence of religion. Moreover, if this definition be adopted, we cannot longer regard religion as peculiar to man. We must admit that the feeling of a dog or a horse towards its master is of the same character; and the baying of a dog to the moon is as much an act of worship as some ceremonies which have been so described by travellers."*

We do not think the two objections urged by Sir J. Lubbock in this passage, to the admission that religion is general to the human race, are sound. The child's dread of darkness and shrinking from a lightless room are certainly not in themselves evidence of its religious nature; but when the darkness awakens in the child any feeling of life beyond its own, however strange and vague that feeling may be, the religious nature, we submit, is proved. The savage is not proved to be religious by the mere fact that he is terrified by thunder, but by the fact that through the terror and the thunder the thought of God is awakened within him.

The objection that, if any definition of religion be adopted which can include the emotions felt by the lowest races of

* Lubbock, p. 139.

men, we can no longer regard religion as *peculiar* to man, may be answered by two considerations. We are entirely ignorant both of the feeling of a dog or a horse towards its master, and of the "inner consciousness" of a dog baying to the moon. Speculate upon instinct as we may, the real life of an animal is unknown, and cannot therefore be pleaded in limitation of a definition of our own nature.

There is, moreover, one patent fact—the unsatisfied fear and awe-struck ignorance of the savage can be traced as they unfold themselves into distinct mythologies. There is an historical connection between the lower and the higher stages of religious thought; and this historical connection, which, to say the least, has never been observed in animals, is in itself a sufficient proof that the most senseless ceremonies described by travellers do not stand upon the level of the moon-baying of a dog. That it has been impossible to discover in the language of many tribes words for God and soul, does not prove the absence of that sense of unapprehended life, which is certainly not atheistic, and to which we believe there is no word applicable save religious, because of its natural and unconscious development into more or less exalted forms of conscious worship.

"The religious theories of savages are certainly not the result of deep thought, nor must they be regarded as constituting any elaborate or continuous theory.....Dulaure truly observes that the savage 'aime mieux soumettre sa raison, souvent révoltée, à ce que ses institutions ont de plus absurde, que de se livrer à l'examen, parceque ce travail est toujours pénible pour celui qui ne s'y est point exercé.' With this statement I entirely concur, and I believe that through all the various religious systems of the lower races may be traced a natural and unconscious process of development."*

In considering the estimate in which Deity is held as a better test for the classification of religions than the nature of the object worshiped, Sir J. Lubbock relieves the whole subject of a very arbitrary distinction. A stone, an ibis, or a wooden idol, may be worshiped with precisely the same expectations and through the same terrors. Men may call upon Jehovah in the spirit of the votaries of Baal. In Christendom there is supposed to be one Object of worship;

---

* Lubbock, p. 143.

and yet traces of fetichism may be found in the services of some house called "Zion Chapel" or "Bethel," and anthropomorphism, in no essential respects distinguishable from that of savage tribes, may characterize the prayers of an excited revivalist. In any classification of religions, even when using the test of the moral estimate of Deity, it must be remembered that sharp lines do not exist in nature. The characters of gods and goddesses are as variable as the weather, and reflect the fluctuating passions of men. In Homer, when the gods act together, they are distinguished by more just and elevated sentiments than when they appear as individuals,* contradicting the common saying of modern times, that a "Board" may give directions which no individual member would endorse. One great stage of religious thought does not disappear before another arises. In the physical history of the globe, the fauna of one formation overlaps that of another. Some inhabitants of Silurian seas lived when continents were clothed with carboniferous forests, as forms entombed within chalk hills exist in the depths of the Atlantic. The superstitions of primeval man may also be found in the heart of a civilized community, surviving the extinction of barbarous circumstance.

When religious feeling exists in its most indefinite stage, the savage does not realize the full distinction between himself and outward objects, whether animate or inanimate. The common dread among savages of having portraits taken, depends upon the idea that the life of the sitter may be injured by being in part transferred to the picture. He feels himself part of the world far more completely than we can understand, and has no strong confidence in his power of preserving his own personality.

When a name is distinctly attached to an object, the word and idea are confused to such an extent, that the name is held to be part of the very being of the man who bears it, so that by it his personality may be carried away.† Clippings of hair, parings of nails, even leavings of food, are so intimately connected with the life of a man, that by practising upon them, the sorcerer, it is imagined, may procure his sickness or death.

Tennyson's description of the child's growth appears

---

* Gladstone's Studies on Homer, II. p. 374. † Tylor, p. 126.

to correspond with the first step in the development of man:

> The baby new to earth and sky,
> What time his tender palm is prest
> Against the circle of the breast,
> Has never thought that "this is I:"
>
> But as he grows he gathers much,
> And learns the use of "I" and "me,"
> And finds "I am not what I see,
> And other than the things I touch."

The baby must be pronounced an Atheist, if the term is to be applied to man in his primitive condition. Ignorance of death as a natural necessity is another point of contact between the child and the savage, which prevents early speculations upon the future from giving any marked colour to religious faith.

"We find a very general conviction among savages that there is no such thing as natural death, and that when a man dies without being wounded, he must be the victim of magic..... Stevenson states that in South America 'the Indians never believe that death is owing to natural causes, but that it is the effect of sorcery or witchcraft. Thus, on the death of an individual, one or more diviners are consulted, who generally name the enchanter, and are so implicitly believed, that the unfortunate object of their caprice or malice is certain to fall a sacrifice.' Wallace found the same idea among the tribes of the Amazons; Müller mentions it as prevalent among the Dacotahs; Hearne, among the Hudson's Bay Indians."*

Fetichism, which presents religion in its first systematic form, is defined by Sir J. Lubbock as the stage in which man supposes he can force the Deity to comply with his desires. Yet fetichism hardly attains to any conception so definite as to include the term "the Deity." A fetich, writes Mr. Tylor, is an object used in witchcraft, and its application to religion has arisen from objects used by the sorcerer being confounded with idols, which have therefore been wrongly called fetiches.† Comte remarks that a child, a dog and a monkey, will each suppose a watch to be alive.‡ The savage has a vague and mysterious feeling that the

---

* Lubbock, pp. 152, 153.

† See an article by Mr. Tylor, Fortnightly Review, Vol. VI. 1866, p. 71.

‡ Comte's Positive Philosophy, trans. H. Martineau, II. 188.

whole world is pervaded by life. There is little or no discrimination of qualities as good or bad, and the faintest shadow of any idea of individual personality; but in everything and everywhere *life* is recognized. Hence any piece of rubbish may become a fetich, a stick, a stone, a feather, since all objects are in themselves equally sacred. Inanimate objects may possess a soul or spirit. The Red Indian* will send with a dead man's soul the soul of a gun or kettle, the corporeal gun or kettle being either left to perish or killed first, by maiming the gun-barrel, and dashing a hole through the bottom of the kettle.

The fetich is the abode of a spirit; and any object may be employed as a fetich, since a spirit may be met at any point. Attempts to influence the fetich are the beginnings of witchcraft; and it is either beaten or thrown away, if unfavourable events occur.

"In China, the lower people, if, after long praying to their images, they do not obtain what they desire, as it often happens, turn them off as impotent gods; others use them in a most reproachful manner, loading them with hard names, and sometimes with blows. 'How now, dog of a spirit (say they to them); we give you a lodging in a magnificent temple, we gild you handsomely, feed you well, and offer incense to you; yet, after all this care, you are so ungrateful as to refuse us what we ask of you.' Thereupon they tie this image with cords, pluck him down, and drag him along the streets, through all the mud and dunghills, to punish him for the expense of perfume which they have thrown away upon him. If in the meantime it happens that they obtain their request, then, with a great deal of ceremony, they wash him clean, carry him back, and place him in his niche again, where they fall down to him and make excuses for what they have done. 'In a truth (say they) we were a little too hasty, as well as you were somewhat too long in your grant. Why should you bring this beating on yourself? But what is done cannot be now undone; let us not, therefore, think of it any more. If you will forget what is past, we will gild you over again.'"†

The moral and religious influences of fetichism in any higher sense can be but slight; yet it indicates an awaken-

---

* Tylor, Fortnightly Review, Vol. VI. p. 76.

† Lubbock, pp. 246, 247.

ing of spiritual activities. It is the beginning of life. Its results are analogous to the first efforts at learning to see, which must be judged by the capacity of the eye, and not by the accidents and delusions necessarily attendant upon the educational process.

More definite religious ideas are formed when special objects are regarded as abodes of unseen powers or centres of their action. Sir J. Lubbock is inclined to refer the worship of animals to the practice of naming first individuals and then their families after particular animals. A family, for instance, which was called after the bear would come to look on that animal, first with interest, then with respect, and at length with a sort of awe; while many animals fulfil in a great measure the conception of a Deity in the mind of a savage.*

Animal worship, which denotes a stage slightly above fetichism, is rather, we would submit, the result of that connection between religious emotions and special objects which is constituted by the first great generalizing effort of uneducated man. An animal would appear especially mysterious to early worshipers, as possessing life different from their own, and which they cannot control. Animal life, as life, would be sufficiently awful to become the incentive to religious exercises. If we look steadily in the face of a favourite dog, and try to interpret its answering glance, the emotion of the savage may not be altogether unintelligible. Any animal prowling about in the night, and a source of danger to man, would attract reverence and suggest the necessity of propitiatory sacrifices. This explains the curious fact that various savage races habitually apologize to the animals killed in the chase.

"The Vogulitzi of Siberia when they have killed a bear address it formally, and maintain that the blame is to be laid on the arrows and iron, which were made and forged by the Russians....Schoolcraft mentions a case of an Indian on the shores of Lake Superior begging pardon of a bear which he had shot. ...So also in British Columbia when the fishing season commences, and the fish begin coming up the rivers, the Indians used to meet them and speak to them. They paid court to them, and would address them thus: 'You fish, you fish; you are all chiefs, you are; you are all chiefs.'...Lichtenstein also

---

* Pp. 183—186.

mentions that if an elephant is killed after a very long and wearisome chase, they seek to exculpate themselves towards the dead animal, by declaring to him solemnly that the thing happened entirely by accident, not by design. To make the apology more complete, they cut off the trunk, and bury it carefully with much flattery."*

The care for sacred animals had a civilizing influence, restraining the ferocity of men and favouring domestic habits.

The association of religious ideas with specific objects would lead to their classification, and ultimately to the conception of a power distinct from the object, and only residing in it. The process of mind is very similar to that by which the child reaches the meaning of an abstract word. The name Totemism is applied by Sir J. Lubbock to this stage when everything may be worshiped; and although the deities still inhabit this earth, they are not entirely controllable by sorcery; and the spirit may belong to a class of objects, and not merely to an individual thing.

The existence of an idol is the sign of a certain extent of mental and spiritual culture. It is far more intimately connected than the fetich with faith in a personal god. Involving the subjugation of many phenomena to one spirit as distinct from others, it implies an act of generalization. It helps the worshiper to cling to his god as a living person, rather than lose him in vague and measureless mystery.

The popular notion that idols are the invention of Satan for the destruction of human souls, must yield to the historical fact that they do not belong to the lowest period of degradation, but indicate a marked step in religious progress. Playing with a doll is no sign of the folly of a child; and when a child *can* play with a doll, it has already learnt something of the world, and from its toys will gather wisdom which formal lessons can never bestow.

"Few educated Europeans ever thoroughly realize the fact, that they have once passed through conditions of mind from which races at a lower state of civilization never fully emerge; but this is certainly the case, and the European child playing with its doll furnishes the key to several of the mental pheno-

---

* Lubbock, pp. 198, 199.

mena which distinguish the more highly cultivated races of mankind from those lower in the scale....Unlike as the toy may be to what it represents in the child's mind, it still answers a purpose, and is an evident assistance to the child in enabling it to arrange and develop its ideas by working the objects and actions and stories it is acquainted with into a series of dramatic pictures. Of how much use the material object is in setting the mind to work, may be seen in taking it away and leaving the child with nothing to play with. At an early age, children learn more from play than from teaching; and the use of toys is very great in developing their minds by giving them the means of, as it were, taking a scene or event to pieces, and putting its parts together in new combinations, a process which immensely increases the definiteness of the children's ideas and their power of analysis. It is because the use of toys is principally in developing the subjective side of the mind, that the elaborate figures and models of which the toy-shops have been full of late years are of so little use."*

The idol is as useful in the religious education of the savage as the doll in its place to the child. The vague idea by its aid assumes a definite shape, and the dimly felt presence of an unseen power is uplifted into consciousness of a personal Lord.

Sir J. Lubbock speaks of fetichism as an attack on the Deity, idolatry as an act of submission to Him; and pronounces fetichism and idolatry as not only different but opposite, so that the one could not be developed directly out of the other.† The gulf between the two is, without doubt, too large to be passed over at a bound; and the indefiniteness of fetichism must have been limited by animal worship, or tree worship, or star worship, before the idol could become the symbol of a god. Fetichism, however, we believe, is as prophetic of idolatry as the baby's instincts are prophetic of the child's life, and can scarcely be described as its antagonist. The savage, in flinging away the unfavourable fetich, does not assert himself against his god, but seeks another sacred object which will yield to his wishes; while the idolater may expect a *quid pro quo* for his sacrifices, and resent disappointment more than those who, being less educated, are more easily frightened and have little self-reliance.

---

* Tylor, pp. 108, 109.

† P. 256.

Idols with a combination of animal and human parts, record a long history of confusion between the image and the thing, the name and the object, the sign and the symbol; although in higher stages of civilization they are more or less purely symbolical of certain attributes, of which the head of a lion or the wings of a bird may be the expression. A rude sense of fitness determines the shape and colour of an idol.

"The white man stands to the savage painter for the portrait of the Evil Demon, especially in Africa, where we find the natives of Mozambique drawing their devil in the likeness of a white man; while Römer, speaking of the people of the Guinea coast, says that they say the devil is white, and paint him with their whitest colours. The pictures of him are lent on hire for a week or so by the old woman who makes them, to people whom the devil visits at night. When he sees his image, he is so terrified that he never comes back. The impersonation need not, however, be intended by any means as an insult to the white man. As Captain Burton says of his African name of Muzungu Mbaya, 'the Wicked White Man,' it would have been but a sorry compliment to have called him a good white man. Much of the reverence of the savage is born rather of fear than of love; and the white colonist has seldom failed to make out that title to the respect of the savage which lies in the power, not unaccompanied by the will, to hurt him."*

While the dim sense of a mysterious life pervading all objects is becoming defined, personal qualities of character are gradually associated with it. Agitated feelings regarding unseen spirits may exist apart from any moral activities of our nature even in Christian communities, and it can be no matter of surprise to find the same phenomenon in the earlier stages of savage life. That man has a nature which in the progress of its education manifests a certain intuitive consciousness of a distinction between actions, not merely as pleasant or unpleasant, useful or useless, but as right or wrong, is a proposition which is simply not affected by the evidence that savages have no words for justice or injustice, for cruelty or humanity, and that theft, revenge, rape and murder, under many circumstances are not held to be crimes. All savage tribes have laws, and are rather the

* Tylor, p. 114.

slaves of rule and precedent than free men.* These laws may forbid some actions which are perfectly immaterial to us, and command others which we declare iniquitous; but whenever there is a demand for obedience on the ground of law, there is an appeal to a consciousness of difference between *ought* and *ought not*. Governor Eyre says of the Australians, that having no moral sense of what is just and equitable in the abstract, their only test of propriety must in such cases be, whether they are numerically or physically strong enough to brave the vengeance of those whom they may have provoked or injured; yet even in Australia there is a limit to the amount of legal revenge.

Crimes "may be compounded for by the criminal appearing and submitting himself to the ordeal of having spears thrown at him by all such persons as conceive themselves to have been aggrieved, or by permitting spears to be thrust through certain parts of his body,—such as through the thigh, or the calf of the leg, or under the arm. The part which is to be pierced by a spear is fixed for all common crimes, and a native who has incurred this penalty sometimes quietly holds out his leg for the injured party to thrust his spear through. So strictly is the amount of punishment limited, that if in inflicting such spear-wounds a man, either through carelessness or from any other cause, exceeded the recognized limits—if, for instance, he wounded the femoral artery—he would in his turn become liable to punishment."†

Does not this passage describe an act of moral judgment among one of the most debased tribes existing upon earth? The character of any special actions performed without shame, does not invalidate the evidence of an attempt to decide justly. We must examine processes of judgment and attempts at decision, not lists of special vices, for indications of the existence of a moral nature capable of education into sanctity. The social development of the idea of moral law may be going on among savages, while their formal acts of religious worship may have no connection with morality whatever. The first traces, indeed, of a moral nature among the lower races must be looked for, *not* in their religions, but in their laws and customs. The Esquimaux tattoo from principle, the theory being that the lines thus made will be regarded in the next world as signs of

---

* Lubbock, p. 345.

† Ibid., pp. 361, 362.

goodness. Among the strange fancies with which men have limited the Divine mercies, we commend to our creed-makers the idea that future happiness will depend upon an orthodox method of tattooing. But the Esquimaux are not without certain amiable virtues, and will befriend an unfortunate hunter although the grace of Heaven may depend upon the lines of the tattoo.

Great dangers and extraordinary diseases are ascribed to special interventions; and hence the idea of receiving harm from Deity appears to precede the hope of blessing. The West-coast negroes represent their deities as black and mischievous, and delighting to torment them in various ways; and there is a general tendency to regard spirits as evil visitors. This fact, however, does not prove the non-existence of any sense of right, although it appears to indicate that the sense of right is not in the earliest stage of its development connected with religious rites. Everything unknown appears in the first instance to be regarded as more likely to be harmful than useful. The suspicion with which the uneducated receive new discoveries is the lingering of the savage's primeval dread of knowledge. The first attempts to gain knowledge are suspected and distrusted as unhallowed; precisely as the chemists of the middle ages were supposed to have the devil for their familiar.

The moment moral elements of character are attributed to the gods, however largely they may be mixed with coarser material, the one great step in religious progress is taken, and the possibility of the existence of Christianity, as a faith demanding purity of life as the ground of access to God, is sublimely foreshadowed.

Are the savages, whose condition has been briefly and roughly sketched, the degenerate descendants of civilized ancestors; or has civilization resulted from a continuous and divinely ordered development?

There seems no historical evidence whatever of any primitive state of civilization. It may be asserted that the first men were morally and intellectually equal to those of the present day; but no record of any of their imagined achievements is left on earth. On the contrary, many customs which originated among barbarians survive in the midst of civilized communities, long after their meaning has been forgotten.

"The use of flint for sacrificial purposes long after the introduction of metal, seemed to me a good case of what Mr. Tylor has aptly called '*survival*.' So also is the method of obtaining fire. The Brahman will not use ordinary fire for sacred purposes; he does not even obtain a fresh spark from flint and steel, but reverts to, or rather continues, the old way of obtaining it, by friction with a wooden drill, one Brahman pulling the thong backwards and forwards, while another watches to catch the sacred spark."*

The gradual development of religious thought among savages may be actually traced, and each stage that passes leaves with its successor some relic of itself. Witchcraft was believed by civilized men long after a nobler faith, essentially in contradiction to the grounds of its existence, had been openly professed. The language of living men is laden with the burden of forgotten mythologies.

The general resemblance between the thoughts and customs of children and savages is so curiously complete, that it claims to be regarded as ground of argument in favour of the opinion that the "development of the individual is an epitome of that of the species."

"Not only do savages closely resemble children in their general character, but a curious similarity exists between them in many small points. For instance, the tendency to reduplication, which is so characteristic of children, prevails remarkably among savages. The first 1000 words in Richardson's Dictionary (down to allege) contain only three, adscititious, adventitious, agitator, and even in these it is reduced to a minimum. There is not a single word like ahi, ahi, evening, &c."†

Sir J. Lubbock, on examining four European and many savage languages, finds that while in the former we get about two reduplications in 1000 words, in the savage ones the number varies from 38 to 170, being about 20 to 80 times as many in proportion.

Although some tribes have fallen from a higher level through the pressure of outward circumstances, the theory of degradation involves the almost inconceivable supposition, that in many of the simplest arts of life men adopted a more tedious and less profitable way of working.‡

The theory that great moral and religious truths were

---

* Lubbock, p. 394. † Ibid., p. 403. ‡ Tylor, p. 192.

known to primeval man, then forgotten, only to be painfully remembered again, does not seem necessary to account for any series of known facts.

Regarding the past history of the world as one of progress, the wild and lawless passions breaking forth in our midst are measured by their connection with the primitive condition of man, and found to be wanting in power to restrain the development of those diviner energies which have through long ages prevailed against them; and the darkest superstitions, when understood as expressions of those who think "as children," become radiant with the glory of prophetic hopes.

HENRY W. CROSSKEY.

NOTE TO ARTICLE, THE MYTHOLOGY OF THE ARYAN NATIONS, Vol. VII. p. 504.

Mr. Cox has called my attention to a passage in the Introduction to his "Tales of the Gods and Heroes" (published in 1862), in which he endeavours to demonstrate the fundamental identity of the national epics among the various Aryan peoples. It is hence evident that the words quoted from M. Bréal in the last number of this Review must be taken solely as a proof that the same idea had presented itself, quite independently, to two comparative mythologists, and that its origination cannot be assigned justly to one rather than to the other.

A. S. WILKINS.

THE THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

No. XXXIII.—April, 1871.

I.—ON MECHANISM, RELIGIOUS AND EDUCATIONAL.

Reasons may be imagined for wishing to be a butterfly, but surely it is going out of the way to cherish an ambition to be a clock. Yet this appears to be the consummation aspired to by modern science.* Certainly if man were a mere machine, his education would be mechanical, and the desire to be "wound up each morning in view of going right all day" would not be extravagant; but if he is more than this, i.e. an organism, having an internal spring of thought and action, his aim should be not only to go rightly but to will rightly, and for this end to cultivate more especially the hidden power on which self-direction depends. And though it may be difficult to define the best mode under all circumstances of doing this, it is at least clear that nothing should be done calculated to enfeeble or supersede the internal faculty most truly constituting the man, both as to what he is or may be. But such depressing influence is really exerted by mechanical treatment and the pressure of outward authority, especially an authority pretending to be divine, and, in virtue of such pretension or otherwise giving to education the character of mere catechism or cram, presented in abstract formulas or ill-understood books. In this respect, mediæval dogma and biblical and even scientific indoctrination stand very much on the same footing. For instruction is subordinate to character; and it is idle to boast of the scientific knowledge of our charity children,

* See Macmillan's Magazine, May, 1870, p. 78. Since reprinted by Professor Huxley in a series of Essays.

"while the schoolmen are forgotten,"* if "science in schools" prove to be little more than scholasticism renewed, since what was a living conviction to the discoverer can only be a lifeless mechanical repetition to the ordinary pupil. Science serves ill purposes as well as good, and is moreover essentially incompetent to deal with the moral side of human nature. And when it is remembered how this is almost wholly left to the wheel-work of custom and authority,—how freedom, browbeaten in the child, is scouted when appearing as originality in the man,—how, further depressed by subdivision of employments, it is systematically undermined by the obsequious insincerity of modern intercourse and literature,—it can be no surprise that men become automata, serviceable indeed for the immediate ends of the politician, but otherwise without root in themselves, and easily yielding to any kind of demoralization.

But nowhere is the demoralizing influence more fatally felt than in ill-directed religious teaching, whether by setting up misleading criteria and encouraging superstition generally, or, as particularly exemplified in Protestant practice, by insisting on an abject worship of the Bible, confounding its dissimilar parts, and protesting against critical explanation. The use of a book is to understand it; and the way to understand is to distinguish, instead of jumbling, the different, having regard to peculiarities of circumstances and the bias or purpose of the author or authors. Had Protestantism been consistent and armed with adequate critical resource, this should have been its attitude to the Bible from the first; but it betrayed its own cause by retreating for the most part to some form of mechanical authority, while others by their ignorant vagaries made freedom ridiculous; and then, when scepticism could no longer be suppressed, a misleading eidolon was fashioned within the nominal circumference of criticism itself, the word being often used where the object is not to promote but to silence inquiry, and to maintain,—in the spirit, if not

---

* The school-boy may now certainly learn in five minutes what occupied Copernicus for thirty years, but it may be questioned how far he is bettered by the lesson. He gets a habit of believing dogmatically formulated inferences which he does not fully understand, and this habit was the essence of scholasticism, the most important phenomenon in mediæval history, ignorance of which can be no proper subject of self-congratulation, though Professor Huxley treats it as such. See Macmillan, as above, p. 74.

the form of scholasticism, a simply defensive attitude in specious vindications of foregone conclusions. Such would appear to be the sense now attached to it in Edinburgh, where the Professor of Biblical Criticism lately advocated in his opening Address* "the bringing back the people to the simple Bible faith of Luther's days," and invoked Divine Providence for protection against German criticism. Alluding to the wide prevalence of scepticism, he tried to reassure his hearers by disparaging the importance of what he termed "attacks," confounding under this opprobrious term the mere temporizer or panderer to frivolity with the honest attempt to deal with literary difficulties. While readily leaving Schenkel's hesitations and Renan's somewhat offensive idyll to the author's censure, we cannot but ask why the critical labours of F. C. Baur, admitted by himself to stand on so different a footing as to learning and ability, should be submitted to the same treatment, and why the exercise of these valuable qualities in so difficult a field should be designated as an attack? Evidently because there can be no compatibility between the two kinds of criticism, that of explanation and that of sustentation, or, to use the author's words, because Baur would account for Christianity without supernatural intervention, his views moreover being neglected in Germany at the present day. But there is no accounting for anything without trespassing on the supernatural, and the alleged German repudiation of Baur may after all be rather a sign of reaction in the nation than a just estimate of his merits.†

No better exemplification of the mischiefs arising from mechanically manipulating the human mind can be given than Christian history as told by the eminent critic whom Edinburgh criticism condemns,—first on the score of undertaking to explain too much, and then for explaining too little. "He fails," says the objector, "to account for Christ and Chris-

---

* Address on some Present-day Attacks on the Christian Doctrine, by Professor Charteris. Blackwood and Co., Edinburgh. 1870.

† That it is not so is the opinion of one of the authorities appealed to by the Edinburgh Professor, namely, Dr. Hilgenfeld (Zeitschrift fur wissenschaftliche Theologie, Vol. IX. p. 293), when he says that "Baur unquestionably laid the firm basis for all future criticism of the New Testament, and little deserves the neglect with which he is now treated." Elsewhere we learn that moral philosophy as well as genuine theology is at present silenced. (J. B. Meyer, Philosoph. Zeitfragen, p. 306.)

tianity ;" and certainly he does not attempt, like Renan and others, to construct a fanciful romance out of conjectural data, but he does what is of much more moment, in pointing out the true moral significance of the life of Christ, and supplying means for enabling others to make a proper use of the documents where alone the materials for such a life are to be found. Without underrating the person and the practical necessity of an influential leader in order to give a firm footing and historical position to the doctrine, he insists that it was the doctrine which gave importance to the person, rather than the person to the doctrine—recognizing in a purer morality, meeting the requirement of a profounder moral consciousness, the unalterable foundation to which, after all its aberrations, Christianity must ever return. In this view, admission to what was termed the "kingdom of heaven" was no outwardly conferred privilege depending on artificial rites or personal connection with the founder, but a natural product of the soul, owing its healthy growth to the genial aptitude (called singleness of vision, or a childlike unsophisticated disposition), which enabled the good seed of outward suggestion to fructify inwardly. Anticipating the objection that "Jesus could not have needed Paul to give to his religion its universal character," Baur shews how this universality essentially appertained to a religion of ideal righteousness and perfection ; so that there originally existed in it a tendency to discard, in consciousness of its own absoluteness, all vain accessories and outward conditions. But there is a wide chasm between the excellence of a truth and its effectual realization in men's minds ; the excellence of the doctrine would probably in this instance not have rescued it from the oblivion usually overtaking individual efforts of moral reform, but for the support given to it by the authority of an official teacher ; and since, in spite of his denunciations of Pharisaic Judaism, we have no ground for believing that Jesus ever quitted the bounds of Judaism in general, there is little difficulty in conceiving how his followers, who are stated to have been dull and ignorant persons, looked more to the man than the moral, remaining insensible to the importance of the ideal element which is so far from being understood even at this day. We are told of a city* where the cold

---

* Plutarch, De Profect. in virtute.

was so intense that words congealed as soon as spoken, so that winter utterances became audible only in summer; just so the words of Jesus fell dead on the ears of men who, with all their veneration for his person, were unable to appreciate his spirit. To some, perhaps all of them, this personal following, so justly described in the Gospels as insufficient and mechanical,* made the chief item in their character as distinctively Christian: they valued the teaching, not for its intrinsic excellence, but as coming from the lips of one believed to be the Messiah; just as it is now no uncommon thing to look rather to titular distinctions than soundness of reasoning, and to defer to the figure or gown of the professor or clergyman more than to the worth and cogency of his arguments.

But these imperfect conceptions received a rude shock at their Master's death (occasioned, like that of Socrates, by the jealous antipathies of mechanical legalism), the expected Messiah being a victorious hero who should "restore the kingdom to Israel;" so that it became necessary either to abandon their hope or to modify its character. There were two ways of doing this, the readiest being to meet the facts by virtual denial; and they who most relied on personal following would be most disposed to credit the "idle tales" of the women, especially as the doctrine of the resurrection was widely received at the time, and there was Scripture warrant for believing that "the holy one would not see corruption." The effect of such a compromise was merely to postpone the realization of Messianic hopes, to substitute a reanimated Christ for the crucified, in other respects leaving unaltered the conceptions and obligations of Judaism. To minds of higher order such a compromise would be unsatisfactory. Looking less to the life than to the lesson, they would see in the forfeiture of one a corroboration of the other. Example is never more generally effective than when exhibiting the good falling in the discharge of duty and perfected through suffering, in those memorable instances where, though the individual sinks, humanity rises, and the moral order is thus suddenly revealed through the obscurities of the physical, like the serene sky seen

---

* Matt. viii. 19; Luke ix. 23, 57, xxii. 33.

through the storm-cloud.* The pain at first felt at such a spectacle is tempered by the satisfaction caused by the triumph of humanity over the worst calamities, a pleasure of the most elevated kind, as appealing to that which is highest and best in us, and tending to make that predominate in our future lives. Such would be the effect of the drama of crucifixion in the more gifted minds alluded to, which, admitting the facts, would rise superior to the notions traditionally connected with them; and recognizing in Jesus only the ideal spirit of his teaching, would discard along with the prejudices as to the impossibility of his death their reliance on Judaism generally. As in all true education the first step is the renewal of the mind in the sense of inspiring it with a desire to rise or expand,† or what may be called the transition from the mechanical to the ideal state, so in the case here before us all turns on that momentous revolution in the mind of St. Paul which suddenly made him an ardent convert to that which he before persecuted; the light suddenly kindled within him altering his whole nature, enabling him to see excellence and victory where before he had seen only annihilation and disgrace. It is remarkable that while even among the older apostles it is in one place said that "some doubted" (Matt. xxviii. 17), while all were temporarily discouraged, St. Paul, when enumerating the post-mortem appearances of Christ (1 Cor. xv. 8), treats them as all similar in kind, although both his own words (Gal. i. 16; 2 Cor. iv. 6), and the taunts of his opponents, afford the best grounds for believing that at least *his* vision of Christ was purely mental or subjective. But the inward act implied in him a change far transcending in its consequences the easy modification of external belief occurring to the other apostles; it was to him the death of relative and partial, the birth of spiritual or universal religion; the commencement of a truly divine life, since, according to an hypothesis not more paradoxical than some

---

* See Schiller's essay on the effects of Tragedy, and his poem on the Ideal and the Actual. In one of Solon's Elegies (No. 13 in Bergk), divine retribution is similarly compared to the apparition of the blue sky through the clouds.

† In Platonic language, called the putting forth wings (Phædrus), or turning round to the true light (Republic, p. 517, seq.), a process making the subject of it appear blind and even ridiculous in ordinary estimation.

of the postulates of materialism, spirit transcends terrestrial limitations, and in the sphere of the ideal heaven and earth may really be said to blend.* In the new life thus generated he became convinced that, blind before, he now saw clearly for the first time, and "forthwith" proceeded to speak and act in the full sense of the free universality which had been latent in Christianity from the first.

Far from meriting the charge of "omitting the position of the preacher of Christ crucified," Baur particularly shews how the intense pre-occupation of the apostle's soul with an event so inconsistent with Judaical limitations, led him to disavow, not the fact, but the incongruous limitations, and to avail himself of his new-found liberty in "immediately" blending the consciousness of a Gentile mission with that of a spiritual Christ. Freedom, spirituality, universality, the three varied but fundamentally correlated aspects of one doctrine in Galatians, Corinthians and Romans, comprise, in fact, the great principles of Ethics; a perfect or universal law, a free agent, and the ideal sphere in which alone these principles can act or exist. In all morality, freedom is doubtless the first requisite, and whatever infringes it by decentralizing the agent and imposing artificial constraints,—whether of force or fear, ignorance, superstitious prejudice, or mechanical discipline,—tends to rob the soul of those best energies which are essential to virtuous effort. Again, morality may be viewed, not as virtue, but duty, in relation, that is, to the stress of universal law or order considered as outwardly given or coming from above; yet inasmuch as such a law imposes no real fetter on the will, as only enabling it to realize its own true nature by willing reasonably, it may more truly be described as the acquisition of "a power," an exaltation or enlargement of the willing faculty, and it is this view of the matter which Paul more especially urges, substituting theocentric for anthropocentric theory, and in place of the

---

* For here, as said in Schiller's above quoted poem, we have simultaneously before us the divine ideal of humanity, and divinity stooping from its world-throne to the welcome of the human will. St. Paul's language is not more mystical than Aristotle's, "All plurality implies matter,"—and conversely, "Where matter is not, there is no diversity" (Metaph., 7, 6, and 11, 8); or Philo's (Quod deterior posteriori, &c.), "How should the soul, so small a thing enclosed in heart or brain, embrace the universe, if it be not a portion of the divine soul?—a portion undivided, however, for the divine is extended, not divided."

active word δικαιοσύνη used by Jesus, speaking of human salvation as effected by God's δικαίωσις.

It is on a clear view of Paul's position, as gained from his genuine letters, that Baur's theory rests; and he shews how this position is sharply defined by its antagonism to the reactionary Galatians and to the so-called "Christ-party" among the Corinthians. We are here at the point of divergence of the two forms of Christianity above indicated, the internal and the external, the spiritual and the mechanical; one characterized by an attempt to realize the axiom, "follow after righteousness;" the other harping upon the narrower but more readily appreciable injunction, "follow me." Baur first shewed how the seeds of later corruption were laid in the ambiguity of directions at first seemingly identical, and how upon a careful consideration of their real incongruity and practical antagonism depends the correct appreciation of Christian history and literature. The incongruity, first seen in the expulsion of the Hellenistic Christians to Samaria, was further exemplified in the arrogant behaviour of the apostolic party in Jerusalem, when, in spite of a preliminary arrangement with St. Paul allowing the validity of his Gentile mission, they incessantly pursued him with vexatious interference, requiring Gentile converts to observe Mosaic laws, a requisition quite inconsistent with the nature of Christianity as he understood it. The illiberal after-thought, confounding morality with legality, and impressed, not without effect, on the Galatians, was soon followed up by another attack, disputing Paul's personal right to an independent commission, addressed to the Corinthians; wherein for the first time appears that narrow insistance on legitimate succession and outward authority which has gone so far to undermine Christianity, and to substitute a false idol in its place. A harder task was here imposed on the apostle, namely, to maintain his ground against the obvious and tangible claims of official leadership; for what availed it to plead internal conviction if the guardianship of infallible truth were supposed to be inalienably vested in the personal associates of Christ? He could only appeal to his more abundant and more effectual labours, so conspicuously contrasting with his infirmities, and to the truly divine nature of that ideal life which formed the basis of his faith, and which had nerved him in his enterprizes.

Baur is further charged with unduly exaggerating the importance of this quarrel, and making it, as a continuous antagonism, the key to the entire subsequent development. "It is amazing," says the Edinburgh critic, "that so great a superstructure should be raised on so narrow a foundation." But the foundation is by no means narrow, if its dimensions be fully and conscientiously measured. The book of Acts certainly tries to obliterate its traces, and after narrating, for instance, the riot excited by Demetrius the silversmith, in which heathenism alone appears in hostility to Paul, proceeds to say how, on his last journey, "he went by Ephesus," without assigning any adequate* reason for his doing so, and how he summoned the elders of the community over which he had formerly presided to Miletus. Yet there was assuredly good reason for his keeping aloof, and a reference to Eusebius† may help us to understand it. We here learn how, after Paul's departure, John immediately took up his residence in Ephesus as official high-priest of Asiatic Christianity, leaving little doubt that an ascendancy had then been gained by the inimical majority, consisting of the "beasts" and "grievous wolves" who had been Paul's "adversaries" (1 Cor. xvi. 9) from the first. In the Galatians it appears plainly enough from whom opposition proceeded. Its authors were the so-called "apostolic pillars," the "seeming somethings," who by their emissaries following up Paul's labours, insisted on imposing upon his converts the obligation of circumcision and other "beggarly elements" of Judaism; and it is remarkable that in his rejoinder the apostle nowhere meets his opponents by questioning the validity of their delegation and claiming the formal concurrence of the apostles in regard to these matters, as supposed in Acts, with his own proceedings; on the contrary, he sets them at defiance, declaring his own authority to be equal to theirs, even that which they regarded as highest, and describing how he had already reproved Peter to his face. Not less clear is the nature of the opposition in Corinthians. There the adversaries are described as "deceitful workers," "false

---

* The true reason for the journey to Jerusalem as well as for avoiding Ephesus is here suppressed (ch. xix. 21, xx. 16), although it must have been known to the writer (comp. ch. xxiv. 17), who could not have been a stranger to Paul's Epistles.

† Hist. Eccl., iii. 23 and 31.

teachers" and "false brethren," who, armed with letters of recommendation from Jerusalem, controverted his apostleship, impugned his disinterestedness, derided his language and appearance; in short, spared neither artifice nor calumny in lowering him in the estimation of the Gentile communities originally founded by him. Here, as in Galatians, the attack proceeds from persons in authority insisting on the paramount claims of pure Hebraism, legitimate establishment and carnal affinity, or personal association with Christ. Against these boasters Paul feels constrained "to glory" or boast in return, declaring himself their equal as an Israelite, and insisting on an apostleship, or "belonging to Christ," not a whit inferior to theirs, or even the "very chiefest" pretenders to that dignity (2 Cor. xi. 5, xii. 11); moreover, bitterly rallying the Corinthians for the ready servility with which they submitted to the specious pretensions of foolish, vain-glorious men, which no one of sense and spirit would have tolerated.* Yet he ironically avails himself of this tolerant humour to answer folly with folly, though varying the grounds of self-laudation; adding to the rest of his vindication the boast of his more abundant labours and infirmities, because it was the especial aim of the preacher of Christ crucified to be made like him in suffering as in triumph.

With this latter idea is probably connected the peculiar way in which the "adversary" is here represented. Before, "beast" was the name not unreasonably given to men acting with brutal malignity and ferocity; here the conflict is transferred to the supersensual world, as being carried on with the great spiritual adversary Satan;† for Satan is also termed *ἀνημέρος θήρ*, a dragon or roaring lion, and Jesus himself was indifferently said in tradition to have contended with beasts and with demons.‡ Now turn to the official language of the newly-established authority at Ephesus, and read the counter denunciations in the second and third chapters of the Apocalypse. In these, the churches are congratulated seriatim in an apostolic circular for having detected and exposed certain lying pretensions to apostleship, put forth on the part of persons pretending to be

---

* 2 Cor. xi. 4—very ill translated in the English version.

† 2 Cor. xi. 3, 14; comp. ii. 11.

‡ Mark i. 13; and see M. Krenkel in Hilgenfeld's Zeitschrift, Vol. IX. p. 371, seq., on Paul's Theriomachia at Ephesus.

Jews, but not really so, and rather belonging to the "synagogue of Satan,"—pretenders comparable to "Balaam," the great type of false and adverse prophecy, "who sought to cast a stumbling-block before the people of Israel by teaching them to eat meats offered to idols;" and elsewhere again nicknamed "Nicolaitans," a synonymous Greek term derived from a proselyte of the city (Acts vi. 5) in which Paul achieved his first successes. The "synagogue of Satan"—the false pretenders to Judaism, are throughout the subject of this furious invective; and even poor Lydia of Thyatira is rewarded for her hospitality to Paul by being included in the execration, under the title of "that woman Jezebel." Such were the consequences of the jealousy excited by the successes of St. Paul's free gospel, the extent of whose liberality had not been originally contemplated, and whose spiritual pretensions laid him peculiarly open to attack; for there were many who, according to his own showing, misunderstood the meaning of spiritual freedom; and indeed it was something which only the spiritually-minded were able to comprehend. Hence, in competition with the recognized "pillars" of the church, it was of little use for him to refer to his labours, his sufferings for Christ's sake, his consciousness of integrity of purpose; in spite of the revelation in which he boasted to have "seen" Christ, he could not make good the claim to have seen him in the same way as the other apostles; and he found with anguish that the vision which was conclusive for himself could not exercise the same influence over others. His teaching, which had been far from popular during his life, seems to have been almost obliterated at his death. Galatia, Corinth, and Rome reverted, in great measure, to Jewish Christianity; and, guided by sympathy of opinion rather than historical accuracy, ungratefully placed the name of Peter beside or even before that of Paul, as that of their real founder.* A story, too, was circulated that he was no real Jew, but by birth a heathen, who having been circumcised in order to become qualified to marry the daughter of the Jewish high-priest, had after all been disappointed in his suit, and so induced to vent his spleen in abuse of circumcision and Mosaical institutions generally. We have seen how he fares in the

* Dionysius of Corinth in Euseb., H. E. ii. 25; Recognitiones Clem. x. 71.

Apocalypse, where the expression, "twelve apostles of the Lamb," is meant, according to Neander, to imply his exclusion from the list; the "Philippians" also, and other secondary "Pauline" letters, clearly indicate the unextinguished malevolence and general preponderance of his enemies.* The Gospels of Matthew and Luke abound in traces of antagonism, sometimes left as antithetical propositions, loosely dispersed or bracketed together, to find a balance as they may in the reader's mind; sometimes stated controversially, as where Paul is glanced at as a propagator of *ἀνομία*, and teaching men to neglect the minor commandments;† or where, as in Luke ix., the older apostles are elaborately ridiculed and unfavourably contrasted with the Gentile apostleship collectively represented by the "seventy."‡ The Epistle of James apostrophizes Paul as a "vain man;" the Judaizing Papias, the stickler for orthodoxy and legitimate transmission, can have no other in view when inveighing against propagators of "vague doctrine alien to Christ and to truth;" Hegesippus quotes him§ only to denounce his utterances as "lying against the Lord;" Justin, certainly not unacquainted with his writings, though never naming him, reprobates as impious blasphemers the teachers permitting the eating of idol meats, calling them unworthy the name of Christian, as disseminating the doctrines of deceiving spirits; and in a somewhat later writing of the Petrine class,‖ Peter is made to ask, in the style of the Corinthian adversaries, "Why should we believe that the Lord, who so long familiarly conversed with us, has appeared to you, if your doctrine differs from his; why, if really an apostle, do you contend against me, the great pillar of the church, supplanting me in the opinion of the people?" The language of this work, now generally admitted to point, under the name of the arch-heretic Simon Magus, to the Pauline doctrine as renewed by Marcion and to Paul himself, offers a painful view of the state of Christian feeling; transferring to Peter, in analogy with other writings of the class, the true apostleship of the Gentiles, in

---

* Philipp. i. 15, ii. 20, iii. 2; Coloss. iv. 11; 2 Tim. iv. 10, 14, 16.

† Matt. v. 19, and vii. 15, 23.

‡ It being supposed by the Jews that there were seventy nations, according to Deut. xxxii. 8, and Exod. i. 5.

§ Schwegler's Nachapostolische Zeitalter, i. 352.

‖ The Clementine Homilies, 17, ch. xix.

opposition to the claims of a false pretender. "Many of the Gentiles," says Peter, "have rejected my preaching of the law, having adopted the naughty antinomian doctrine of that detested individual (ἐχθροῦ ἀνθρώπου); so that I, the firm rock and foundation of the church, am treated as damnable!* Why, to call me 'damnable' is to accuse God who revealed Christ to me, and Christ also, who hailed me as blessed on that account. Certain persons try by artful interpretation to distort my words, and to make me out a subverter of the law, while hypocritically suppressing my real opinions; but God forbid that I should so act, for this would be to attack God's law as given to Moses, whose eternal obligation was attested by Christ. These persons would seem to know my mind and to comprehend my words better than myself; and if they venture to utter these falsehoods during my life, how much more after I am dead! Beware then, and whenever a teacher or prophet comes before you unprovided with letters of recommendation from James, take heed lest it be a machination of the devil."†

The use of the term Simon Magus in this work deserves special notice. It seems to have been sufficiently shewn‡ that it originally belonged to a Samaritan, or rather Phœnician, sun-deity (Semo or Sem; comp. Samson, Schemesh), and thence came to be applied by orthodox Jews§ to designate the impure heresy of their Samaritan neighbours. How natural, then, for the first Judaically orthodox Christians, already known from the Apocalypse as ingenious in devising injurious epithets, to give the same name to the first extra-judaical converts, and how equally natural to affix it particularly to the great patron of Gentile conversion, regarded in Judaical tradition as the apostate introducer of a new heathenism! The Magus of the Clementines doubtless includes the Gnostics, but the ulterior allusion to St. Paul, as "coryphæus of all heresy,"‖ is there at least unmistakable; the Gentile apostle being other-

---

* Κατεγνωσμένος—the word used, Galat. ii. 11. † Hom. xi. 35.

‡ See Zeller's work on Acts, p. 169; also Baur's Gnosis; Schwegler's Post-apostolic Age; and especially Volckmar, Tub. Journal, Vol. XV. p. 279, on the origin of Simony.

§ Josephus, Antiq. xi. 8, 6, 7. According to Justin, Apol. i. ch. 26, the names "Simonian" and "Samaritan" are nearly equivalent.

‖ Comp. Irenæus, i. 23, 2, and elsewhere.

wise clearly recognizable in many special traits of the false teacher. Among other peculiarities, he is described as claiming immunity from death, a claim still more emphatically made by some of his successors ;* as an adept in Egyptian magic, and the Alexandrian resource of allegorizing the Old Testament ; as denying the efficacy of works ; as having a large following in Samaria, and advocating Mount Gerizim in opposition to Jerusalem ; and, finally, encountering Peter in Rome, and there falling in mortal conflict. He is further described as maintaining in controversy with Peter the superior reliability of visionary revelations, Peter hinting in reply that the supposed vision might be fanciful, or sent by the devil ;† and accordingly the warning against admitting doctrines not accredited by James, is based on the suggestion that diabolical wickedness, disappointed in the forty days' conflict with Christ, continued its insidious intrigues in the semblance of false teachers like Simon, whom, "falling from heaven as lightning," it instigated and sent forth through the world.‡ In fulfilling this sinister office, Simon certainly led the way in the Gentile mission ; but if men had known the true mystery, how in the providential order of the world the better ever follows the worse,§ they would have seen how Peter coming after should be preferred before him, as light succeeding darkness, knowledge ignorance, health disease. The theory of priority and posteriority is here ingeniously adapted to the facts, since Peter and other emissaries from Jerusalem unquestionably followed up with jealous opposition the labours of Paul, and, according to the criterion usually adopted in such cases, were justified in doing so. But the false teacher, pursuing the course of his mythical prototype from East to West (or from Palestine to Rome), persisted in giving himself out as "some great one," or as "the great power of God ;"‖ but the god quoted by him

---

* Comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 4 with 2 Tim. ii. 18.

† Hom. ii. 22, xvii. 13, 14. The wicked one, it is here said, vanishes in a flash of light without explaining anything.

‡ Hom. xi. 35. The words probably here alluding to Paul's miraculous light (2 Cor. iv. 6) and sudden conversion.

§ Hom. ii. 17.

‖ In the increasing prevalence of monotheism, it was not uncommon to assign to heathen gods subordinate rank as "emanations" or "powers" of the Supreme God (see Zeller, ibid., p. 170) ; and with such an idea Paul's language (1 Cor. ii. 4, 5 ; 2 Cor. xiii. 4, &c.) might easily be connected.

was an idol, and the spiritual power which he wielded he owed to sorcery.* He may indeed have been converted and baptized, but right to apostleship he had none;† by his renunciation of the law he shewed the error of his faith, by his "bitter" language to the apostles, the malignity of his heart. He added "wickedness" (κακία) to other evidences of perversity, when, conscious of the spurious character of his own gifts and accomplishments, he was obliged after all to appeal to the true apostles, since from them only he could obtain the seal of legitimate authority, the power of conferring the holy spirit by laying on of hands. And now observe the "iniquity" of this man; he thought to obtain the inestimable gift by an offer of money;‡ an offer prompted by the expectation of making more money by the bargain, since, as intimated in the 2nd Epistle to the Corinthians, Paul was taunted for making a profitable speculation by his ministry. Doubtless the apostle, who so indignantly denies this latter charge, had given colour to the former part of the accusation by the fidelity with which he adhered to the stipulation recorded in Galatians, where it appears that he really tried to obtain the friendly concurrence of the other apostles, readily acquiescing in the condition of collecting alms annexed to the concession. In pursuance of the compact, he had throughout been unremitting in making collections for the "poor saints" through Galatia, Macedonia and Achaia, vainly hoping by this labour of love to propitiate the implacable and to disarm hostility. Not even the persevering malignity of his opponents unmistakably exhibited induced him to renounce the obligation; but then how odious in the party benefited to requite his generosity by so vilely distorting its motives, and while sternly withholding the ostensibly sought boon, representing a free gratuity as a self-interested or "Simoniacal" act!

Enmity to Paul continued among the Ebionitish successors of his first adversaries, evinced by denial of his authority and repudiation of his writings;§ and we have just

---

* A remarkable anticipation of that subtle identification of heresy and sorcery which was so common in the middle ages. See Soldan's History of Witchcraft, p. 160, &c.

† Acts viii. 13, 21, 23. ‡ Comp. Galat. ii. 10; Acts viii. 19.

§ See Eusebius, Hist. E. iii. 27, and Irenæus, i. 26, 2.

seen the rancour excited by Marcion's revived Paulinism in the language of one of the party. But this could not be a general or final verdict; and supposing the party exasperation revealed in "Romans" to have in some measure yielded to the written and oral pleading of the apostle himself, we may fairly conceive his death, significantly referred to in legend as the era of reconciliation, to have greatly helped in healing the animosities dating from the affair at Antioch. But peace is not always progress. Jew Christianity, though not incapable of expansion, was chiefly so in the sense of an external comprehension, which, dropping the more incompatible of the old ordinances, and exchanging circumcision for baptism, had its compensation in equivalent concessions as to the meaning of "faith" and "law," the unbroken continuity of revelation, and especially the apostolic primacy of Peter. Hence an approximation to unity, though in a sense very different from that which Paul contemplated. When, by reducing the notion of faith to mere external adhesion, morality had subsided into legality, it was easy to look upon Christianity as nothing more than an improved Judaism, and in this sense eagerly to welcome the results of its successful propagation, including (as intimated in the notion of Christ's descent to hell) a retrospective benefit even for the exiles of the old covenant. From the other side appears to have proceeded that exaltation of Christ's person beyond the strict limits of monotheism, in which he appears, not indeed spiritual in St. Paul's sense, but ruler of the spirit-world, or head of a celestial hierarchy. The doctrine of "Philippians," "Colossians" and "Ephesians," upon this subject, is already visible in the Pauline basis of Luke's Gospel, where Jesus, no longer a mere descendant of Abraham, but the universal Redeemer, son of Adam and of God, conspicuously exhibits his superhuman power in a series of victories over the demon world; and where, far more emphatically than in the canonical Matthew, who allows the admission of Gentiles in defiance of conflicting statements, Christian universality is made a prominent doctrine in a series of special narratives and parables, while the "violence" supposed in Matthew to characterize Gentile intrusion disappears. Here the saying, that "those who are not with us are against us," is balanced by the counter declaration, that "those who are

not against us are with us;" and while in the 9th and 10th chapters the efficient labours of the subsequently elected "seventy" are favourably contrasted with the ignorance and drowsiness of their older rivals, the career of Jesus is in great measure transferred from Galilee to Samaria, where his protracted sojourn prefigures those preparatory labours for the Gentile harvest which, according to the fourth Gospel, the older apostles were undeservedly to reap. In our Luke, Pauline doctrine is considerably softened, the law, for instance, being associated with the Gospel as of equal validity, and Jesus as Jewish Messiah inconsecutively made to be rejected in his own country, Nazareth, before going to Capernaum; still it is remarkable how the legitimate apostolic recipients of the mysteries are here reprimanded instead of complimented,* and how Satan's lightning-fall, the Jewish travesty of the scene of Paul's conversion,† is stated as a triumph consequent on the labours of the seventy. In a still more obsequious vein, the writer of Acts undertakes an elaborate justification of Paul, omitting the characteristics of his genuine doctrine, and making him throughout the submissive delegate of the older apostles. In direct contradiction to his own statement, he is here said to have "straightway" gone after his conversion to address Jews in the synagogue, and to have only been induced by threat of assassination and a vision in the temple to enter on the Gentile mission; and this only after Peter, relieved of his Judaical scruples by the vision of the table-cloth, had set him the example, and when the church of Antioch had been already founded by men of Cyprus and Cyrene![‡] Unable to omit altogether the conflict between the true Simon and the false, the legendary reflex of the Antioch altercation, he conceals its import by placing it in a different connection, in which Peter alone appears on the Christian side, while Paul is still an enemy to all Christianity. The capitulation said to have been hastily concluded in the

---

* Luke xviii. 18, 21; comp. Matt. xii. 49, xiii. 11.

† Clem. Hom. xi. 35.

‡ It may not be without significance that Simon of Cyrene, who as a Hellenist stands in close affinity with the alleged founders of the church of Antioch, is traditionally connected with St. Paul (see Mark xv. 21; Rom. xvi. 13), and made to "bear the cross" (Gal. ii. 20; 2 Cor. xi. 23) after the desertion of the other apostles.

second chapter of Galatians is expanded into a deliberate apostolic decree, conceding admission of the Gentiles on the footing of proselytes of the gate; while the subsequent quarrel dwindles down to a difference of a totally different kind and minor importance (ch. xv. 39). With the obliteration of doctrinal differences we lose sight of the traces of personal antagonism, until the offences of Paul having been expiated by the legendary Magus, the former is allowed a portion of his rightful claim as co-founder of the Roman church, and admitted as a "dear," though somewhat dangerous and unintelligible "brother," into the catalogue of saints.*

The end of the series of compromises here indicated could only be the unity of the church, formed by the coalition of average sentiment under despotic authority and the exclusion of unreconciled extremes as heretical; an hypothesis historically justified, and to those really wishing to understand the Christian literature offering a clue for the purpose. But now what are we to think of the resulting consummation, the house built up of nicely fitted stones by a spiritual windlass,† the safe and sound basis of doctrine desired in the Pastoral letters? Was the peace thus reached by a process of natural selection and political expediency a secure rest for the soul in the sense of morality and St. Paul, or only the stagnation foreboding corruption and decay? Its true character was speedily exemplified in the direction to shut the door in the faces of heretics,‡ and the spurious toleration of Bishop Victor for the mortal sins of moral delinquents. Its maxims were indulgence for sin, implacable severity to dissent; and so all-influential became these principles of an orthodox establishment, that even Origen deemed it less culpable to offend against the moral law than to infringe the rule of faith.§ In repudiating Mosaic law, St. Paul forgot the difficulty of replacing it by an available substitute; the spiritual law of which he spoke required interpretation, and no interpretation was presently forthcoming but that of custom, expediency or individual caprice. Hence Chris-

---

* 2 Peter iii. 15; Ignatius to the Ephesians, ch. xii.; Polycarp to the Philipp. ch. iii.; Apost. Constit. ii. 57.

† Hermas Vis. iii. 5; and Ignatius to the Ephesians, ch. ix.

‡ 2nd Epistle John i. 10; Titus iii. 10. § Comment. in Matt. xxxiii.

tendom continued to oscillate between fanatical asceticism and an equally fanatical licence, save where it found a stay in the artificial legality of the church. But here the stress originally laid on the founder's person affected the law and its administration throughout.* As regards the intellect, it took the form of arbitrary dogma, often gathered up from the lowest strata of popular credulity, a creed chiefly consisting of exact definitions of the nature of the redeeming person, which it was thought meritorious to believe in proportion to their intrinsic incredibility. It thus became what Mosaic law had been before, a veil obscuring heaven's light, a machine for making popular instinct swallow its own garbage,—as the transubstantiation dogma, for instance, embodies in creed what had only been the vulgar misapprehension of a metaphor. In regard to the will, it consisted of statutory mandates issued irrespectively of intrinsic goodness† or man's moral nature, obedience to which was thought meritorious in proportion to their purely conventional character and practical uselessness. The administration of this system through the sacraments enclosed man's entire life with a net-work of artificialities, excluding the possibility of independence, and appealing to no criteria but those of ecclesiastical authority; until at last the Pope was identified with God, as exemplified in the claim of infallibility and supremacy over right and wrong.‡ The true moral law requires no superadded bribe, for its import is only the effectuation of man's best nature; the church system, by definitively sanctioning the severance of the act from its reward, encouraged the immoral notion that but for the expected remuneration it were better to act as the brutes. Church absolutism was further strengthened by a doctrine which to Paul had served as a plea for religious emancipation, namely, that of original sin, or the Semi-

---

* Augustine, in fact, defends the cause of arbitrary external authority on this very ground. De utilitate credendi, ch. xiv.: "Ipsum videmus nihil prius atque fortius quam credi sibi voluisse."

† For instance, Tertullian says (De Pænitentia, ch. vi.): "Non quia bonum est ideo debemus auscultare, sed quia Deus præcipit"—the counterpart of his maxim for the intellect, "certum quia impossibile."

‡ This not altogether modern doctrine was based on John xiv. 17, xvi. 13, and Luke xxii. 32: "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not;" it being hence inferred that the faith of Peter *and his successors* could never fail. See Gieseler's Church History, ii. 2, 228, 229.

pelagian modification of it allowing exceptional merit to acts performed in its service. But the sin here meant was not so much self-injury as disobedience to a master arbitrarily punishing and condoning, and excusing laxity in one thing or person on the score of extra austerity in another; so that in this external or legal mode of treatment, penances originally imposed as evidence of contrition, soon came to be taken as an equivalent or satisfaction, until at last, by free use of the idea of substitution, the issue of indulgences became a traffic, in which every sin had its money price.

And when the scandals of mechanical religion produced the Reformation, the evil—felt in its pressure rather than its causes—failed to suggest a just estimate of the nature of the remedy. The evil was the obliteration of the bases of morality, human freedom and divine order, by a tyrannical coercion pretending to be divine; but Luther's doctrine was in some respects more depressing still, admitting no spring of healthy activity in man, no salvation save as a grace or favour founded on that very notion of communicable merit which had been a main source of church abuses. Then the inconsiderate transference to the Bible of the absolute authority before wielded by the Church, produced an equally oppressive superstition; grammar being required to bend its rules to the caprices of the sacred text, and the plainest duties, such as respect for parents, made to owe their validity solely to the scripture mandate.* In view of fanatical and semi-rationalist efforts for a more thorough realization of its principle, Protestantism rapidly retired to the old resource of ecclesiastical organization, and Luther, who before had boldly discarded those parts of the Bible which he disliked, did not hesitate in the sacramental controversy to quarrel with his best friend about the literal meaning of a word. Partial vindications of freedom—Socinian, Deistic or Pietistic—availed little when freedom was ill understood, and when the radical error of a God-deserted world rendered the notion of law, considered as a "rule set," if not a revelation, as unfavourable to morality as before. Higher notions of the universe and of man's true dignity were needed; but

* Luther's Larger Catechism, iv. 20. The Lutheran dogmatist says, "Ad regulas grammaticorum exempla bonorum auctorum et cum primis *θεοπνέυστων*, non sunt exigenda."

for these, even where occasionally uttered, opinion was unripe, and the voices of Eccart, Picus of Mirandola, Bruno and Spinoza, were either unheard or unheeded in a world of mechanical slaves. In one way, however, philosophy did succeed in usefully interposing in favour of the world and human nature, obtaining full permission to labour ministerially in supplying material wants. When dismissed as a dangerous ally from the service of theology at the close of the scholastic period, an exception was made in favour of the modest claims of physical science, which indeed nominalism first suggested and originated. After wasting its first crude efforts in pursuits of theosophy, science proceeded in a more sober spirit to devise a method or mechanism (organon) by which even a moderate capacity might be led to discovery and certainty. Of course the notion was a mistake, and indeed it was partially admitted to be so by its proposers; for philosophy is inseparable from science, and the phenomena prolific of discovery are scarcely more obvious than the conceptions appropriate for grouping them. But the fact of its being entertained—as exemplified, for instance, in Bacon's wish to "level wit and intellect," and never to leave the mind unguided*—exemplifies the psychological want of the system. And this becomes still more manifest when we review its general effects in regard to nature and to man. Looking exclusively to observation and the exact enumeration of particulars, it eschewed conceptional generalities, especially teleology, or the general contemplation of nature's beauty and order, together with the literary records of the human thoughts suggested by them; reserving nothing but phenomena offered to the senses, and the partial inductions derivable from specimens, elementary substances, molecules and atoms. "He who would describe a living thing," says Goethe, "seeks first to drive the spirit out of it; he then holds the parts in his hand, only unluckily the spiritual bond is wanting." But considering that upon the spiritual bond here deliberately overlooked depend the foundations of morality, may not those who so pulverize the world, and reduce its order and beauty to mere clockwork or a scramble for existence, be appropriately addressed

---

* "Restat unica salus ut mens nullo modo sibi permittatur, sed perpetuò regatur."—Nov. Org., Preface; also Bk. i. Aph. 61 and 122.

in the words of the same poet: "Woe, woe, this beautiful world, thou hast destroyed it; but do thou, strongest among the sons of earth (i.e. Faust, or the free intelligence roused at the Reformation), initiate a new career of life by building it up again fairer than before in thy bosom"? The Reformation comprised elements of general culture which were not immediately appreciated, and the internal could not at once fill the vacancy left by the overthrow of the external. Yet the extreme iconoclasm in question was in many respects provisionally justified, not only by the expediency of excluding teleological considerations from physical research, but also that of subverting many false idols, theological and philosophical; indeed, nothing but the mechanical view of nature and of man was left open to science at its outset by the ecclesiastical monopoly inherited from the middle ages. But in this view, inverting nature's order, reducing life to chemistry, and chemistry as far as possible to mechanism, there was no room or relish for moral philosophy, and man was considered by Hobbes, as by the Jesuits, in the light of a mere mechanically guided force. And since only considerations of this kind are open to empirical science, it can be no surprise to find psychology even now confounded with physiology, while freedom and its vast capabilities are misrepresented or denied by the scientific Professor, who talks of measuring consciousness by the pound weight, and longs for freedom to do right minus the freedom to do wrong.* But it is odd he should not see that freedom minus freedom is nullity, and that in espousing this nullity and accommodating education to the hypothesis, he repeats the worst mischiefs of ecclesiastical systems. "It is because the body is a machine," he says, "that education is possible. Education is the formation of habits, the superinducing an artificial organization of the body, so that acts at first requiring effort, eventually become unconscious and mechanical." Just so the Church treated and still treats the subject of its manipulations as an automaton or bundle of habits, substituting function for intention, the determinations of authority for the free exercise of intelligence, until the individual will is wholly superseded, and, as in the Jesuit formula, man becomes a galvanized corpse. Doubtless the forma-

* Macmillan's Magazine, as above.

tion of habits forms an important part of education, but the operation transcends the limits of physiology; ethics and a profounder psychology are here principally concerned, and all their resources are needed both to guard the character at first, and then to fortify its capacity for self-guidance in correcting and enlarging its conceptions, and so arbitrating between them in their representative function as motives, as to engender an habitual preference for the larger and more rational. Had the Professor attentively followed up the course of the ideal philosophy* in the books cited by him, he might have seen that the soul or living agent, instead of being a mere bodily appendage serving to "turn on the tap," or to act ministerially in giving signals for nerve motion,† has a creative power of its own, a sphere of free activity over and above its incrustations of habit, one even more worthy of study, especially in connection with education, than the bodily mechanism; and that in regard to this free activity he might better have inverted his above quoted axiom by saying, "Because the mind is not a machine, therefore education is possible."

R. W. Mackay.

---

* Subjective idealism means psychology, in the sense of analysis of consciousness; though if to this be added explanations of the marvellous machinery by which communication is kept up with the outer world, there can be no reasonable objection. The *physiological psychologist*, on the other hand, begins with the machinery, ignoring the testimony of consciousness, and referring the entire action of the mind to the senses and their operations as open to empirical observation—anatomical, statistical, linguistic, even railway returns and the quotations of the corn and cattle market being made tributary for the purpose. Such is the procedure insisted on by F. A. Lange in his work on the History of Materialism, pp. 472—475, a work recommended for translation into English by Professor Huxley, though certainly one not a little open to criticism in many of its statements. See Prof. Schilling's review thereof, "Kritik des Materialismus," Leipsig, 1867.

† Mind being concerned in all consciousness, even in sensation, the materialist adroitly uses the fact to bring all mental action, including thought and reasoning, within the sensational sphere in which mechanism is most apparent; so that the mental is thus made to appear wholly mechanical, and the old hypothesis of a soul a fanciful illusion or "Seelengespenst." See Lange, as above, pp. 427, 456, 468, 494, &c.

II.—THE SPIRITUAL UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

PERHAPS there is no question which within the last few years has assumed more sudden and grave importance to the whole Church, and which must continue to command more earnest thought on the part of those most alive to the hopes and perils of the present time, than that of the possibility of greater unity of faith and worship among Christians. We see everywhere the signs of dissatisfaction and unrest in the survey of things as they are at present—an unrest which is accompanied by many hopeful tokens of a yearning after nearer fellowship among all with whom fellowship is possible; and which even the vague fear of treason in themselves to what is vital in Christian truth,—a feeling so constantly present in the minds of the timid,—is not sufficient to check. A conviction is abroad that, however wide may be the differences which have separated Christians from each other. there is somewhere to be found a common ground which they may occupy, and from which united action and worship are possible. That this conviction is shared by so many of those most earnestly alive to the dangers which appear to threaten the oldest foundations of theological truth, and who most feel the presence of the fire which is surely trying every man's work of what sort it is, will be thought a sufficient justification of every honest endeavour (however inadequate it may be) to bring light into a subject so serious.

Even those who do not believe that the existence of what we most reverence in man is in any way seriously affected by the various changes in theological opinion, would probably be willing to grant that some danger lies in the present scattered state of the forces of those who represent religion and right. Though the foundations of all honour and nobility in our nature could be shewn to stand in no relation to the realities of faith and love, it would still be a matter of pressing need that men who are really resting upon the same spiritual foundations should understand and feel what those foundations are. This, however, is putting an extreme case, which does not in reality exist. All earnest men are agreed in believing that religious faith and right action do stand thus closely related to each other in

the universal life of the world. The shiftings of theological opinion—where there is no grasp of a higher faith—endanger not only the spiritual life of the Church itself, but the sanctity of moral relations everywhere. In the most literal as well as in the most spiritual sense, it is true that "where there is no vision the people perish."

The object of this paper is not to attempt the discovery of any theological basis upon which to raise a structure of completer unity in the Church; still less is it to point out any distinct course of action,—such as the establishment of a society,—in which all those who desire this end may find refuge. The comparative failure of the various attempts of this sort which have already been made, and in which the hearts of so many good men have been engaged, must make us feel that no effort to renew them would have in it any real hope of success. Our endeavour will be rather, by a brief survey of the thoughts and hopes which are common to all Christians, and by seeking calmly to recognize the manifold ways in which the One Spirit is working everywhere in the Church, to awaken a consciousness of the spiritual union already existing.

A danger against which it is most difficult to guard, appears always to threaten those who have most to do with the discovery and development of religious truth—the danger of making separations among men between whom no real separation exists, and of putting up boundaries which, in the light of a clearer day, are discovered to be unnecessary and hurtful—hindering the free interchange and flow of life between those who desire such communion. The check to this danger is only found in a more thorough feeling of the debt we owe to that Great Love which works through all and in all, and in a more earnest desire to recognize *His* presence in every form of good in our life. Indeed, it is here, while groping among the toils of common life, and endeavouring to look the solemn facts of our existence in the face, that we are sometimes best able to realize the presence and action of the stupendous spiritual forces which have made our Christian society what it is, and which are the true bonds of union between the different parts of the Church. As the real foundations of faith are in the spiritual facts of the universe, and in the soul's relation to them, so the one problem, which embraces

all others, is the discovery and recognition of what that relation is. All questions of the authority of historical religion sink into insignificance in comparison with the discovery of the spiritual truths to which we stand spiritually related, and without which the soul cannot really live. Whatever is not bread must in the end perish. No heart of man truly hungering to be fed would desire that this should be otherwise. No real danger threatens any spiritual truth in which the faith of the most orthodox is resting. We may well be at peace; the smell of fire will not pass upon any portion of the truth from which it would be death to the Church to part. The shock may be terrible, and we may wring our hands standing amid the broken fragments of the house which sheltered us. But while we are gazing, behold! another home has arisen. In the new temple the worshipers will be more numerous, and the song will rise into higher strains than in that which time and decay have laid in ruins.

It will be the aim of this paper to shew that the basis of a true unity in the Church may be found in that reverent attitude of mind and heart towards the great truths of spiritual religion, which is seen to characterize all Christian believers, although differing widely in their theological opinions. Allowing and claiming that some forms of religious belief, and the reception of certain dogmas as articles of creed, are most favourable to the development of such an attitude of mind, we dare not refuse to own that gold is gold because it has not passed the mint whose stamp would perhaps have saved us all trouble of inspection or testing. If the thing is there, to deny its existence argues folly or fear.

I. In illustrating this position, we would speak, first, of the large and increasing body of those who, while accepting generally the spirit of Christianity and the teachings of Christ, entirely reject the supernatural and miraculous in the records of his advent to the world. The grave question which is being continually asked is, What bond of union is there, if any, between these and the (so-called) "orthodox believer"?

It may be said in reply, that these men occupy the same position as that of the early followers of Christ—of

those, in fact, who first listened to his words and earnestly sought to be instructed by him; who were, moreover, prepared to follow whenever by his teachings he led them into paths of holiness and peace; but who could not recognize in his person any of the attributes which have been claimed for him since his death and resurrection. Surely between these and the vast church of those who have received what they believe to be the fuller teaching of Christianity there must exist a bond of real union, which should find somewhere a common action and life. We may claim for them a posture of devout reverence and submission before the mind of Christ, an attitude of attentive piety as in the presence of a great Teacher, with whom their own religious nature is seeking to be in entire accord. If it is argued that they are guilty of rejecting Christ in his higher mission, and that they do not therefore really occupy the position we have claimed for them, it must be replied that the judgment of their guilt is in other hands than ours, and that the assumption of such a position by the orthodox is—not to use any stronger term in relation in it—altogether unchristian in its spirit. These men are not scoffers at Christ because they reject what others have claimed for his person. They ought, therefore, to be recognized as occupying the position of disciples—as among those who desire to follow the teachings of the Saviour. This much they have a right to claim even from those who feel most strongly that their views of the person of Christ are inadequate.

Following this train of thought, we are conducted into wide regions, where it is impossible not to feel that we are still walking in the society and companionship of the same men, and that no walls of partition are between us. The worship of God, as a God of love, as One whom the heart must utterly trust, and who is our only hope and consolation, the Giver of joy in sorrow, and of peace amid the distresses of time and sin—should mean something in a man's life. And he who, walking the same earth and surrounded by the same mysterious conditions, can see at his side his brother-man and fellow-worshiper of the same God without feeling any movement of the heart to helpful recognition and sympathy, has missed something of the spirit (however securely he may be holding by the

letter) of the faith of Christ. Men did not always so think of God and worship Him with love. If we have climbed to this common platform of loving adoration, and are able to stand together there, shall we refuse to do so because some of us have come by a pathway sacred to us, as trodden by holy feet, while others have come up by different and more rugged ways? If we are here together upon the mount, we may surely worship together, for our God is their God. The acceptance of the Great Fatherhood of Love *is* a bond of real union, and it should be the endeavour of all true believers to give it expression in life. Even if it were admitted (which by the present writer it is not) that the world does not owe its acceptance of this doctrine to the wide-spread belief that Jesus in teaching it spoke with the authority of God Himself, the case would not be altered. As a matter of *fact*, we have all together drunk of this spirit from the teachings and from the life of him who "spake as never man spake." We ought at least to accept this fact as a bond of common union between us.

This spirit of real union between those who believe Christ's appearance on earth to have been altogether miraculous and supernatural and those who deny this, may be further shewn to exist in their common faith and hope in God, in regard to His dealings with men. The recognition of the existence of a divine purpose in the affairs of the world, and that devout and earnest yearning of the heart towards its fulfilment for the good and salvation of all, is an additional bond of common sympathy between these two classes which ought especially to be cherished. More now, perhaps, than at any period of history is the existence and growth of this spirit to be desired and prayed for by the Church. It stands distinctly opposed to those two most formidable opponents of the faith of Christ—selfish worldliness and the fatalism of law. The hell-born doctrine of the right of the strongest to grasp all he can, and having grasped to hold and use it as his own, is already beginning to cast a dark shadow across the path of advancing civilization, and to threaten every relation of life. In the contest between class and class, which is in danger of becoming every day more bitter, it is a matter of no ordinary interest that the men who are together able to recognize a divine purpose of good in the sorrows and struggles

of our race—who will not acknowledge the right of selfish power to trample upon the weak—and who, amid the temporary triumphs of evil, still hold by their hope in the ultimate conquest of good—should know how to recognize each other's presence, and be willing to stand shoulder to shoulder where the exigencies of the contest most need their presence. A difference as to what is the basis of dogma upon which their faith is resting, is not a thing which should hold such men apart from each other. They are one in this at least, that their hope for men is in the love of God. Is it reasonable that in the very thick of the battle they should be addressing to each other words like this: "Your views as to the authority of the Teacher are not sound, while you accept the teaching from his lips: therefore we must be as enemies, although we are fighting together on the same side"? Yet this is too often the position assumed by the orthodox in their relations to the party whose theological position is opposed to their own.

And again, in the attitude of opposition to religion which science is supposed to have assumed, we may recognize another and the most formidable opponent to the highest teachings of Christ. The reign of dead Law everywhere, which labels and tickets the most sacred emotions of the soul, and pushes back cause and effect till it puts a force upon the throne from which the God of love is banished—which robs life of the highest impulses to obedience and holiness of heart, and gives us a stone of fate when we asked for bread—must be regarded at least as standing in a position of some antagonism to the faith of those who are able to pray with unfeigned lips, "Our Father in heaven,... thy kingdom come." In the conflict between these two kinds of teaching, even those who most strongly reject the supernatural in Christianity must still be regarded as distinctly on the side of Christ. They are holding by the same faith which above all others marked and characterized his life. They accept his teaching as the expression of their own deepest consciousness of spiritual relations, beyond which there is no appeal. They live according to the spirit of his words. They are the uncompromising opponents of that school the tendency of whose teachings is to put Law in the place of God, and to rob the heart of its faith in the great providence of Love which rules the world.

A basis of common faith and action in the Church may be further shewn to exist in the universal recognition by its members everywhere of the doctrine of human brotherhood. I shall of course be told that no such basis is to be found in any common recognition of this truth; that its teachers have been men to whom the world has owed the least; that the representatives of that part of the Church which has held, and still holds, the widest sway in Europe, would altogether deny a place to this doctrine in the teachings of Christianity;—while the Revolution which in modern times adopted this brotherhood as its battle-cry, ended by wrapping Europe in a mantle of blood. To this it must be replied, that not the less is it true that those who believe in the brotherhood of men must be ranked as distinctly on the side of Christ in the hour of conflict which is coming and now is. The same assertion may be made of every true and noble doctrine which has dwelt in the hearts of men. Atonement and salvation, forgiveness and mercy, by the folly of those who taught them, have dipped their garments in blood, though they went forth to save the nations. Nor is the time yet come when it may with safety be affirmed that the freedom (of which the faith in human brotherhood is the deep source and spring) has ceased to be in any danger from its enemies. The loyal and passionate devotion of the American people to this faith decided, in our own time, one of the most awful conflicts of history. And the end is not yet. In the solution of the problems of the relation and possible commingling of Eastern and Western civilization, questions will arise of stupendous import, which can only be settled upon this common gathering-ground of the peoples—that "God has made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth."

Questions there are, too, whose solution is of more immediate and pressing interest to us, which may be shewn distinctly to have their roots in this larger one of the universal relation of man to man. The question of rights of property in its bearings on our rapidly-increasing pauperism, is one of these. The existence of standing armies, and the action of governments in devoting large bodies of citizens to the profession of the sword, is another. The political action of majorities as it will affect the life and welfare of the weaker members of the State, is yet another.

These questions, and many others of the same sort, point to the same source for their answer. Those who still hold to the thoughts of men's relation to each other which have been handed down to us through the spirit of Christ's teaching—who believe that men everywhere are to be loved and served, not used and trampled on—have still reason enough, in the present aspect of things, to cling fast together. Whatever theological differences may exist amongst them, they are the true representatives in the world of the spirit of Jesus, and form his spiritual church.

I will now only briefly refer to other bonds of sympathy which flow from the common recognition of the same spiritual truths. The belief in the sacredness of human life and the sinfulness of its wanton destruction, rests most surely upon our faith in the love of God to men, and our hope in the destiny of the race. The same must be said for that other thought—to which the hearts of the true and faithful are clinging with a more passionate earnestness perhaps than to any other—the Christian idea of purity. Among good men who have drunk of the spirit of Christ's teaching, there is only one feeling on this subject. They believe that the highest thoughts of the sacredness of the relation between man and woman have been developed in the atmosphere which Christ has diffused abroad in the world. Yet those who are most alive to the tendencies of modern thought know well that even this citadel is not safe from attack. The time may yet come when it may be of some importance to the world that those who represent the distinctly Christian idea of morals should be in a position to know how to act together.

The firmer grasp of the belief in immortality, and a quiet acquiescence in the will of God in death, may be given as one result of the wide-spread teaching of the Christian religion, irrespective of the dogmatic foundation upon which this faith is supposed to rest. Men who themselves deny the fact of the resurrection of Christ, still breathe the atmosphere of trust which this faith has diffused abroad, and receive a life from it of which we believe they are themselves unconscious. So much is this the case, that we may perhaps venture to say that it would be impossible for any of us to think and feel in this particular, as though no such faith had ruled in the hearts of men through the Christian ages. The belief in

our immortality has become part of our very being. Though the historical foundations upon which this faith is believed by the orthodox to rest should be shewn to all men to be utterly untrustworthy, it would still be believed by the vast majority of them, that

> "In the great gospel and true creed
> Christ is yet risen indeed,
> Christ is yet risen."

It has become a common habit of thought with us to think of the life of man as only here in its infancy, and our hopes for the most degraded run on into the future. This faith is a possession; and however it has come, let those who hold it learn to encourage its existence in each other as a bond of no common union between them.

I shall perhaps be thought to go much too far if I affirm the same thing to be true of the New Testament teaching in regard to sin. Yet I believe it. No prophecy has ever been more literally fulfilled than that one which said, "He shall convince the world of sin." The wide-spread belief among good men in the "exceeding sinfulness of sin" has become a sacred bond of union between them. They may disagree about the dogmas of the Christian religion so entirely as almost to make it appear that there is nowhere a common ground for them to occupy. Yet it is found that they all hate sin, and together burn for its destruction from the earth. The theories of social right which leave the individual wrong unchecked, they regard with unconquerable hatred. And further,—if this question is pressed,—they will be found to approach near to each other in a still deeper region, and one in which they have perhaps supposed themselves to be the farthest apart—for these fountains of spiritual life are too deep and rapid in their flow for our light plummets of the intellect to reach their sources. Press any of these men—the most orthodox on the one side, and on the other the most heterodox—for the foundations of his hope of a soul's redemption from evil, and it will be found to lie in the one common faith in the communion and pitying love of the Spirit of God. Such men will probably have various theories as to the advent of the Spirit and its reign in the soul, but they both believe in its presence, and cling to this faith as the one hope for darkened and sinful hearts.

In concluding the part of this paper which is intended to refer especially to the position of those who deny altogether the supernatural and miraculous in the advent of the Redeemer, I have only to ask, "Does all this to which we have sought to direct attention stand for nothing"? Are the men who come so near to each other in all that is dear and awful to the spirit of man, to be considered as standing in no relation to each other like that of members of the same Church?

The conscience of the whole Church must pronounce such an assumption to be in direct antagonism to the spirit and to the teachings of Jesus.

II. If the position we have advanced on behalf of those who reject the supernatural in Christianity be a sound one, a much stronger plea may be put forward for the existence of a deep bond of union between the holders of orthodox opinions and those who, while denying the deity of the Saviour, still believe him to have been (in some unique sense) a revelation from God. In judging of the position and claim of these to be recognized as members of the Church of the Saviour, let us remember that there never has been in the Church perfect unity of opinion on this subject. In all ages of the Christian history there have been those who believed in Christ, who were yet unable to agree as to what they believed *about* him. Nor have the times when men have fought most for their several opinions as to the place he should occupy in their theological creeds, been those in which his spirit has most prevailed in their lives. A calm survey of the way in which the fact of his existence—the love and hope which he brought to the world—has survived through all the strife about his person, will teach us much. The faith of Christ may and does exist in the heart of many a man who would meet the question of whether Christ be God with a flat denial. It is hard and very often impossible for men trained in Christian "orthodoxy," and who have breathed no air outside, to understand the difficulties which assail the faith of another, whose whole habit of thought has been different, when the foundations of his religion are stated baldly to him as resting upon a proposition which at once strikes him as monstrous or blasphemous.

Were the fact more readily admitted among the orthodox,

that a spiritual relation between Christ and the soul may exist side by side with various degrees of faith in the supernatural character of his appearance upon the earth, they would have in the spiritual recognition of the Lord a better guide as to the limits of charity than the most severe examination of the merely intellectual position will ever be able to give. In the end, we believe the spiritual will itself establish the historical. No amount of critical research will ever take away from us that without which the faith of the Church cannot live. The most startling apparent violations of law must ultimately either disappear, or else shew themselves to be the sources in which all law has had its origin. If the Church can live without the miraculous facts of the incarnation, they will fall away. If she cannot live without them, they are in no real peril so long as the shrine of that awful Light which, coming into the world, lighteth every man, is guarded and kept in the heart of the individual believer.

The duties which the orthodox owe to the spirit of Christ's religion, and the pain of their separation from men who in every other respect are upon the same platform with themselves, are alike increased when we see how near to them in opinion—even upon this subject where the difference between them is widest—are some of those to whom men of all parties owe not a little, but who are yet esteemed to be living outside the communion of the Catholic Church. While the representatives of the Established English Church have been looking far away for sympathy and fellowship in Eastern Christendom, they have yet failed to recognize the men who, standing at her very doors, have climbed up, alone and by steep and rugged paths, to a recognition of Christ. The same accusation must be brought against the representatives of other bodies of Christians. It is, as I think, a subject for reproach against them, that men who believe about Christ that he revealed "the perfect thought and inmost love of the All-ruling God .... being the very Logos—the apprehensible nature of God—which long unuttered to the world, and abiding in the beginning with Him, has now come forth and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth,"*—have never received from any party of the so-

* Endeavours after the Christian Life, by James Martineau—Sermon, The Sphere of Silence, p. 508 (2nd edition).

called orthodox church the cordial and fraternal recognition their position in this respect entitled them to claim.

III. The good which would result from a wider diffusion of the spirit of mutual recognition which we have advocated among all sections of the Church of Christ, would be deep and immediate. That large class to be found everywhere, of sensitive piety, but easily moved to fear when they see the representatives of various theological opinions standing towards each other in an attitude of antagonism or of cold isolation, would be reassured and strengthened. An earnest desire would spring up among faithful workers to remove whatever can and ought to be removed from the forms of worship and modes of action in the churches which is a stumbling-block to free communion with their brethren. There would be a stretching of hands across the barriers of theological dogma which separate us, and a willingness on the part of all to meet and act together whenever such united action could be attained. No doubt the difficulties which hinder any attempt at united worship are at present very great. Especially is this the case in that part of the Church where forms of prayer are used in the service. Those ancient sentences in which the piety of earlier ages has wrapped up the secrets of the soul's nearest communion with its Lord, seem as though they must lie upon the altar for ever. They have become to the Church the symbols of the Life itself. But they are not the Life. The new wine of the great coming feast may require the renewal even of these. When the time for their renewal comes (if it ever does), there will be no pang in parting from the old.

But chiefly we must expect good from the acceptance of the principles advocated in this paper in the larger fields of action and modes of work which would be opened to the Church. No one can pretend that the life of the Church has at present adjusted itself to the enlarged life of the world. New problems present themselves every day, for which she can offer no solution. The heroic efforts of the various bodies in the Church, and of individual members of them, to check the ever-swelling tide of pauperism and misery, are like a baby's foot put down to hold back a river. Would not a more enlarged and comprehensive action be possible, were the whole Church of Christ able to act toge-

ther in this matter? Again, what word is being now spoken with authority from the lips of the great body of those who believe in Christ on the momentous questions affecting the relations of class and class which are every day becoming more pressing? An opportunity of united action arising out of the state of Europe has presented itself within the last few months, such as has not occurred before in our time. But so far as the action of the whole Church is concerned, it has escaped notice. Had the whole Church in this country of those who love God and men, and hate war and blood, been at the present time in full accord and able to act together, instead of contributing only a few thousands towards the relief of the helpless and dying on the Continent, they might have sent millions, and done far more even than they have done to stanch the wound of the nations. Such an act would have given to this country in the councils of Europe a position of moral power which she has not had in the proudest years of her history. Among the immediate results of such a unity would be the re-adjustment of the relations between the Church and her foreign missions. The way in which the work of the missionary is so often destroyed by the trader, is a most serious hindrance to the growth of piety among the converts to Christianity. If the work of missions could be carried out on the large scale which the changed circumstances of the Church and of the world seem now to demand, our colonists would become missionaries, and our missionaries would be supported by the presence with them in their various fields of labour of numbers of those who know how to represent Christ to the world as upright tradesmen, honest labourers and skilled mechanics. An immense relief might be given to the fearful pressure upon our crowded population by the united action of the Church for the furtherance of schemes for Christian colonization upon a large scale. Such schemes—if conducted with wisdom and energy—would carry blessing and hope to the hearts of thousands. They would relieve all classes of society, for all classes would be represented in them. The large sums of money which are yearly wasted in being doled out to the helpless, sinking crowd in our vast cities, would in this way be invested for their best interests, and in due time the capital itself would come

back again with blessing into the hands of the givers. The space allotted to this paper does not allow me to pursue these suggestions further. Those who accept the main position assumed in it, will probably be willing to admit that the life and action of the whole Church is suffering not a little as the result of its present divided state, and that much blessing and enlarged work would immediately flow from a more earnest recognition of the deep bonds of union which already exist among all shades of opinion in her midst.

LEIGH MANN.

III.—DARWINISM IN MORALS.

The Descent of Man. By Charles Darwin, M.A., F.R.S. Two vols. 8vo. London: Murray. 1871.

IT is a singular fact that whenever we find out how anything is done, our first conclusion seems to be that God did not do it. No matter how wonderful, how beautiful, how infinitely complex and delicate has been the machinery which has worked, perhaps for centuries, perhaps for millions of ages, to bring about some beneficent result—if we can but catch a glimpse of the wheels, its divine character disappears. The machinery did it all. It would be altogether superfluous to look further.

The olive has been commonly called the Phœnix of trees, because when it is cut down it springs to life again. The notion that God is only discernible in the miraculous and the inexplicable, may likewise be called the Phœnix of ideas; for again and again it has been exploded, and yet it re-appears with the utmost regularity whenever a new step is made in the march of Science. The explanation of each phenomenon is still first angrily disputed and then mournfully accepted by the majority of pious people, just as if finding out the ways of God were not necessarily bringing ourselves nearer to the knowledge of Him, and the highest bound of the human intellect were not to be able to say, like Kepler, "O God, I think thy thoughts after thee!"

That the doctrine of the descent of man from the lower animals, of which Mr. Darwin has been the teacher, should be looked on as well-nigh impious by men not mentally chained to the Hebrew cosmogony, has always appeared to me surprising. Of course, in as far as it disturbs the roots of our old theology and dispels the golden haze which hung in poetic fancy over the morning garden of the world, it must prove a rude and painful innovation. A Calvin, a Milton and a Fra Angelico, may be excused if they recalcitrate against it. Doubtless, also, the special Semitic contempt for the brutes which has unhappily passed with our religion into so many of our graver views, adds its quota to the common sentiment of repugnance; and we stupidly imagine that to trace Man to the Ape is to degrade the progeny, and not (as a Chinese would justly hold) to ennoble the ancestry. But that, beyond all these prejudices, there should lurk in any free mind a dislike to Darwinism on *religious* grounds, is wholly beyond my comprehension. Surely, were any one to come to us now in these days for the first time with the story that the eternal God produced all His greatest works by fits and starts; that just 6000 years ago He suddenly brought out of nothing the sun, moon and stars; and finally, as the climax of six days of such labour, "made man of the dust of the ground," we should be inclined to say that *this* was the derogatory and insufferable doctrine of creation; and that when we compared it with that of the slow evolution of order, beauty, life, joy and intelligence, from the immeasurable past of the primal nebula's "fiery cloud," we had no language to express how infinitely more religious is the story of modern science than that of ancient tradition?

Nor are we (I trust it is needless to add) alarmed or disturbed because the same hand which has opened for us these grand vistas of physical development has now touched the phenomena of the moral world, and sought to apply the same method of investigation to its most sacred mysteries. The only question we can ask is, whether the method has been as successful in the one case as (we learn from competent judges) it may be accounted in the other, and whether the proffered explanation of moral facts really suffices to explain them. Should it prove so successful and

sufficient, we can but accept it, even as we welcomed the discovery of the physical laws of evolution, as a step towards a more just conception than we had hitherto possessed of the order of things; and *therefore*—if God be their Orderer—a step towards a better knowledge of Him.

The book before us is doubtless one whose issue will make an era in the history of modern thought. Of its vast wealth of classified anecdotes of animal peculiarities and instincts, and its wide sweep of cumulative argument in favour of the author's various deductions, it would be almost useless to speak, seeing that, before these pages are printed, the reading public of England will have spent many happy hours over those "fairy tales of science." Of the inexpressible charm of the author's manner, the straightforwardness of every argument he employs, and the simplicity of every sketch and recital, it is still less needful to write, when years have elapsed since Mr. Darwin took his place in the literature of England and the philosophy of the world. Very soon that delightful pen will have made familiar to thousands the pictures of which the book is a gallery. Every one will know that our first human parents, far from resembling Milton's glorious couple, were hideous beings covered with hair, with pointed and movable ears, beards, tusks and tails,—the very Devils of mediæval fancy. And behind these we shall dimly behold yet earlier and lower ancestors, receding through the ages till we reach a period before even the vertebrate rank was attained, and when the creature whose descendants were to be heroes and sages swam about in the waters in likeness between an eel and a worm. At every dinner-table will be told the story of the brave ape which came down amid its dreaded human foes to redeem a young one of its species; and of the sagacious baboon which, Bismarck-like, finding itself scratched by a cat, deliberately bit off its enemy's claws. Satirists will note the description of the seals which, in wooing, bow to the females and coax them gently till they get them fairly landed; then, "with a changed manner and a harsh growl," drive the poor wedded creatures home to their holes. The suggestion that animals love beauty of colour and of song, and even (in the case of the bower-bird) build halls of pleasure distinct from their nests for purposes of amusement only, will be commented on, and afford suggestive

talk wherever books of such a class are read in England. Few students, we think, will pass over without respectful pause the passage* where Mr. Darwin with so much candour explains that he "now admits that in the earlier editions of his Origin of Species he probably attributed too much to the action of natural selection," &c.; nor that† where he calls attention to Sir J. Lubbock's "most just remark," that "Mr. Wallace, with characteristic unselfishness, ascribes the idea of natural selection unreservedly to Mr. Darwin, although, as is well known, he struck out the idea independently, and published it, though not with the same elaboration, at the same time." Whatever doubt any reader may entertain of the philosophy of Evolution, it is quite impossible that, after perusing such pages, he can have any hesitation about the true philosophic spirit of its author.

But we must turn from these topics which properly concern the journals of physical science, to the one whose treatment by Mr. Darwin gives to a Theological Review the right to criticise the present volume. Mr. Darwin's theories have hitherto chiefly invaded the precincts of traditional Theology. We have now to regard him as crowning the edifice of Utilitarian ethics by certain doctrines respecting the nature and origin of the Moral Sense, which, if permanently allowed to rest upon it, will, we fear, go far to crush the idea of Duty level with the least hallowed of natural instincts. It is needless to say that Mr. Darwin puts forth his views on this, as on all other topics, with perfect moderation and simplicity, and that the reader of his book has no difficulty whatever in comprehending the full bearing of the facts he cites and the conclusions he draws from them.

In the present volume he has followed out to their results certain hints given in his "Origin of Species" and "Animals under Domestication," and has, as it seems, given Mr. Herbert Spencer's abstract view of the origin of the moral sense its concrete application. Mr. Spencer broached the doctrine that our moral sense is nothing but the "experiences of utility organized and consolidated through all past generations." Mr. Darwin has afforded a sketch of how such experiences of utility, beginning in the ape,

---

* Vol. I. p. 152.

† P. 137, *note*.

might (as he thinks) consolidate into the virtue of a saint; and adds some important and quite harmonious remarks, tending to shew that the Virtue so learned is somewhat accidental, and might perhaps have been what we now call Vice. To mark his position fairly, it will be necessary to glance at the recent history of ethical philosophy.

Independent or Intuitive Morality has of course always taught that there is a supreme and necessary moral law common to all free agents in the universe, and known to man by means of a transcendental reason or divine voice of conscience. Dependent or Utilitarian Morality has equally steadily rejected the idea of a law other than the law of utility; but its teachers have differed exceedingly amongst themselves as to the existence or non-existence of a specific sense in man, requiring him to perform actions whose utility constitutes them duties; and among those who have admitted that such a sense exists, there still appear wide variations in the explanations they offer of the nature and origin of such a sense. The older English Utilitarians, such as Mandeville, Hobbes, Paley and Waterland, denied vigorously that man had any spring of action but self-interest. Hume, Hartley and Bentham, advanced a step further; Hartley thinking it just possible to love virtue "as a form of happiness," and Bentham being kind enough elaborately to explain that we may truly sympathize with the woes of our friends. Finally, when the coldest of philosophies passed into one of the loftiest of minds and warmest of hearts, Utilitarianism in the school of Mr. Mill underwent a sort of divine travesty. Starting from the principle that "actions are only virtuous because they promote another end than virtue," he attained the conclusion, that sooner than flatter a cruel Almighty Being he would go to hell. As Mr. Mill thinks such a decision morally right, he would of course desire that all men should follow his example; and thus we should behold the apostle of Utility conducting the whole human race to eternal perdition for the sake of—shall we say—"the Greatest Happiness of the Greatest Number"?

At this stage, the motive-power on which Utilitarianism must rely for the support of virtue is obviously complex, if not rather unstable. So long as the old teachers appealed simply to the interest of the individual, here or hereafter,

the argument was clear enough, however absurd a misuse of language it seems to make Virtue and Vice the names respectively of a systematized and an unsystematized rule of selfishness. But when we begin to speak of the happiness of *others* as our aim, we necessarily shift our motive, and appeal to sympathy, to social instincts, or to the disinterested pleasures of benevolence, till finally, when we are bid to relinquish self altogether in behalf of the Greatest Happiness of the Greatest Number, we have left the Utilitarian ground so far away, that we find ourselves on the proper territories of the Intuitionist, and he turns round with the question, "Why should I sacrifice myself for the happiness of mankind, if I have no intuitions of duty compelling me to do so?" The result has practically been, that the Social Instincts to which Utilitarians in such straits were forced to appeal as the springs of action in lieu of the Intuitions of duty, have been gradually raised by them to the rank of a distinct element of our nature, to be treated now (as self-interest was treated by their predecessors) as the admitted motives of virtue. They agree with Intuitionists that man has a Conscience; they only differ from them on the points of how he comes by it; and whether its office be supreme and legislative, or merely subsidiary and supplemental.

It is the problem of, How we come by such a conscience, which Mr. Darwin applies himself to solve, and with which we shall be now concerned. Needless to say that the Kantian doctrine of a Pure Reason, giving us transcendental knowledge of necessary truths, is not entertained by the school of thinkers to which he belongs; and that as for the notion of all the old teachers of the world, that the voice of Conscience is the voice of God,—the doctrine of Job and Zoroaster, Menu and Pythagoras, Plato and Antoninus, Chrysostom and Gregory, Fénélon and Jeremy Taylor,—it can have no place in their science. As Comte would say, we have passed the theologic stage, and must not think of running to a First Cause to explain phenomena. After all (they seem to say), cannot we easily suggest how man should acquire a conscience from causes obviously at work around him? Education, fear of penalties, sympathy, desire of approval, and imaginary religious sanctions, would altogether, well mixed and supporting one another, afford sufficient explanation of feelings acquired, as Mr. Bain thinks,

by each individual in his lifetime, and, as Mr. Mill justly says, not the less natural for being acquired and not innate.

At this point of the history, the gradual extension of the Darwinian theory of Evolution brought it into contact with the speculations of moralists, and the result was a new hypothesis, which has greatly altered the character of the whole controversy. The doctrine of the transmission by hereditary descent of all mental and moral qualities, of which Mr. Galton's book is the chief exponent,* received, in 1868, from Mr. Herbert Spencer the following definition, as applied to the moral sentiments:† "I believe that the experiences of utility, organized and consolidated through all past generations of the human race, have been producing corresponding modifications, which by continued transmission and accumulation have become in us certain faculties of moral intuition, certain emotions responding to right and wrong conduct, which have no apparent basis in the individual experiences of utility." This doctrine (which received a very remarkable answer in an article by Mr. R. H. Hutton, Macmillan's Magazine, July, 1869) may be considered as the basis on which Mr. Darwin proceeds, approaching the subject, as he modestly says, "exclusively from the side of natural history," and "attempting to see how far the study of the lower animals can throw light on one of the highest psychical faculties of man." His results, as fairly as I can state them, are as follows:

If we assume an animal to possess social instincts (such, I suppose, as those of rooks, for example), and also to acquire some degree of intelligence corresponding to that of man, it would inevitably acquire contemporaneously a moral sense of a certain kind. In the first place, its social instincts would cause it to take pleasure in the society of its fellows, to feel a certain amount of sympathy with them, and to perform various services for them. After this, the next step in mental advance would cause certain phenomena of regretful sentiments (hereafter to be more fully analyzed) to ensue on the commission of anti-social acts, which obey a transient impulse at the cost of a permanent social instinct.

---

* Reviewed in the Theological Review, April, 1870.

† Letter to Mr. Mill, in Bain's "Mental and Moral Science," p. 722; quoted in "Descent of Man," p. 101.

Thirdly, the approval expressed by the members of the community for acts tending to the general welfare, and disapproval for those of a contrary nature, would greatly strengthen and guide the original instincts as Language came into full play. Lastly, habit in each individual would gradually perform an important part in the regulation of conduct. If these positions be all granted, the problem of the origin of the moral sense seems to be solved. It is found to be an instinct in favour of the social virtues which has grown up in mankind, and would have grown up in any animal similarly endowed and situated; and it does not involve any higher agency for its production than that of the play of common human life, nor indicate any higher nature for its seat than the further developed intelligence of any gregarious brute. So far, Mr. Darwin's view seems only to give to those he has quoted from Mr. Spencer their full expansion. The points on which he appears to break fresh ground from this starting-place are these two: 1st, his theory of the nature of conscientious Repentance, which represents it as solely the triumph of a permanent over a transient impulse; 2nd, his frank admission, that though another animal, if it became intelligent, would acquire *a* moral sense, yet that he sees no reason why its moral sense should be the same as ours, or lead it to attach the idea of right and wrong to the same actions. In extreme cases (such as that of bees), the moral sense, developed under the conditions of the hive, would, he thinks, impress it as a duty on sisters to murder their brothers.

It must be admitted that these two doctrines between them effectively revolutionize Morals, as they have been hitherto commonly understood. The first dethrones the moral sense from that place of mysterious supremacy which Butler considered its grand characteristic. Mr. Darwin's Moral Sense is simply an instinct originated, like a dozen others, by the conditions under which we live, but which happens, in the struggle for existence among all our instincts, to resume the upper hand when no other chances to be in the ascendant. And the second theory aims a still more deadly blow at ethics, by affirming that, not only has our moral sense come to us from a source commanding no special respect, but that it answers to no external or durable, not

to say universal or eternal, reality, and is merely tentative and provisional, the provincial prejudice, if we may so describe it, of this little world and its temporary inhabitants, which would be looked on with a smile of derision by better-informed people now residing in Mars, or hereafter to be developed on earth, and who in their turn may be considered as walking in a vain shadow by other races. Instead of Montesquieu's grand aphorism, "La justice est un rapport de convenance qui se trouve réellement entre deux choses ; ce rapport est toujours le même quelque être qui le considère, soit que ce soit Dieu soit que ce soit un homme," Mr. Darwin will leave us only the sad assurance that our idea of Justice is all our own, and may mean nothing to any other intelligent being in the universe. It is not even, as Dean Mansell has told us, given us by our Creator as a representative truth, intended at least to indicate some actual transcendent verity behind it. We have now neither Veil nor Revelation, but only an earth-born instinct, carrying with it no authority whatever beyond the limits of our race and special social state, nor within them further than we choose to permit it to weigh on our minds.

Let me say it at once. These doctrines appear to me simply the most dangerous which have ever been set forth since the days of Mandeville. Of course, if science can really shew good cause for accepting them, their consequences must be frankly faced. But it is at least fitting to come to the examination of them, conscious that it is no ordinary problems we are criticising, but theories whose validity must involve the *in*validity of all the sanctions which morality has hitherto received from powers beyond those of the penal laws. As a matter of practice, no doubt men act in nine cases out of ten with very small regard to their theories of ethics, even if they are educated enough to have grasped any theory at all ; and generations might elapse after the universal acceptance of these new views by philosophers, before they would sensibly influence the conduct of the masses of mankind. But however slowly they might work, I cannot but believe that in the hour of their triumph would be sounded the knell of the virtue of mankind. It has been hard enough for tempted men and women heretofore to be honest, true, unselfish, chaste or sober,

while passion was clamouring for gratification, or want pining for relief. The strength of the fulcrum on which has rested the virtue of many a martyr and saint, must have been vast as the Law of the Universe could make it. But where will that fulcrum be found hereafter, if men consciously recognize that what they have dreamed to be

> "The unwritten law divine,
> Immutable, eternal, not like those of yesterday,
> But made ere Time began,"*—

the law by which "the most ancient heavens are fresh and strong,"—is, in truth, after all, neither durable nor even general among intelligent beings, but simply consists of those rules of conduct which, among many that might have been adopted, have proved themselves on experiment to be most convenient; and which, in the lapse of ages, through hereditary transmission, legislation, education and such methods, have got woven into the texture of our brains? What will be the power of such a law as this to enable it to contend for mastery in the soul with any passion capable of rousing the most languid impulse? Hitherto good men have looked on Repentance as the most sacred of all sentiments, and have measured the nearness of the soul to God by the depth of its sense of the shame and heinousness of sin. The boldest of criminals have betrayed at intervals their terror of the Erinnyes of Remorse, against whose scourges all religions have presented themselves as protectors, with their devices of expiations, sacrifices, penances and atonements. From Orestes at the foot of the altar of Phœbus, to the Anglican in his new confessional to-day; from the Aztec eating the heart of the victim slain in propitiation for sin, to the Hindoo obeying the law of Menu, and voluntarily starving himself to death as an expiation of his offences, history bears testimony again and again to the power of this tremendous sentiment; and if it have driven mankind into numberless superstitions, it has, beyond a doubt, also served as a threat more effective against crime than all the penalties ever enacted by legislators. But where is Repentance to find place hereafter, if Mr. Darwin's view of its nature be received? Will any man allow himself to attend to the reproaches of

---

* Sophoc. Antig. 454.

Conscience, and bow his head to her rebukes, when he clearly understands that it is only his more durable Social Instinct which is re-asserting itself, because the more variable instinct which has caused him to disregard it is temporarily asleep? Such a Physiology of Repentance reduces its claims on our attention to the level of those of our bodily wants; and our grief for a past crime assumes the same aspect as our regret that we yesterday unadvisedly preferred the temporary enjoyment of conversation to the permanent benefit of a long night's rest, or the flavour of an indigestible dish to the wholesomeness of our habitual food. We may regret our *imprudence*; but it is quite impossible we should ever again feel penitence for a *sin*.

But is this all true? Can such a view of the moral nature of man be sustained? Mr. Darwin says that he has arrived at it by approaching the subject from the side of natural history; and we may therefore, without disrespect, accept it as the best which the study of man simply as a highly developed animal, can afford. That glimmering of something resembling our moral sense often observable in brutes, which Mr. Darwin has admirably described, may (we will assume) be so accounted for. But viewing human nature from other sides besides that of its animal origin, studying the mind from within rather than from without, and taking into consideration the whole phenomenon presented by such a department of creation as the Human Race, must we not hold that this Simious Theory of Morals is wholly inadequate and unsatisfactory? Probably Mr. Darwin himself would say that he does not pretend to claim for it the power to explain exhaustively all the mysteries of our moral nature, but only to afford such a clue to them as ought to satisfy us that, if pursued further, they might be so revealed; and to render, by its obvious simplicity, other and more transcendent theories superfluous. The matter to be decided (and it is almost impossible, I think, to overrate its importance) is: *Does* it give such an explanation of the facts as to justify us in accepting it, provisionally, as an hypothesis of the origin of Morals?

It is hard to know how to approach properly the later developments of a doctrine like that of Utilitarian Morality, which we conceive to be founded on a radically false basis. If we begin at the beginning, and dispute its primary

positions, we shift the controversy in hand to the interminable wastes of metaphysical discussion, where few readers will follow, and where the wanderer may truly say that *doubts,*

"immeasurably spread,
Seem lengthening as I go."

All the time which is wanted to argue the last link of the system, is lost in seeking some common ground to stand upon with our opponent, who probably will end by disputing the firmness of whatever islet of granite we have chosen in the bog; and will tell us that the greatest modern thinkers are doubtful whether twice two will make four in all worlds, or whether Space may not have more than three dimensions. Yet to grant the premisses of Utilitarian ethics, and then attempt to dispute one by one the chain of doctrines which has been unrolling from them during the last century, and which has now reached, as it would seem, its ultimate, and perhaps logical, development, is to place our arguments at an unfair disadvantage. To treat scientifically the theories of Mr. Darwin, we ought to commence by an inquiry into the validity of the human consciousness; into the respective value of our various faculties, the senses, the intellect, the moral, religious and æsthetic sentiments, as witnesses of external truths; and, finally, into the justice or fallacy of attaching belief exclusively to facts of which we have cognizance through one faculty—let us say the intellect; and denying those which we observe by another—say the æsthetic taste or the religious or moral sentiments. He who will concede that the intellect is not the organ through which we appreciate a song or a picture, and that it would be absurd to test songs and pictures by inductive reasoning and not by the specific sense of the beautiful, is obviously bound to shew cause why, if—after making such admission in the case of our æsthetic faculties—he refuse to concede to the religious and moral faculties the same right to have their testimony admitted in their own domain.

Proceeding to our next step, if we are to do justice to our cause, we must dispute the Utilitarian's first assumption on his proper ground. We must question whether the Right and the Useful are really synonymous, and whether Self-interest and Virtue can be made convertible terms

even by such stringent methods as those of extending the meaning of "Self-interest" to signify a devotion to the "Greatest Happiness of the Greatest Number" (always inclusive of Number One), and of curtailing that of Virtue to signify the fulfilment of Social, irrespective of Personal and Religious obligations. That the common sentiment of mankind looks to something different from Utility in the actions to which it pays the tribute of its highest reverence, and to something different from noxiousness in those which it most profoundly abhors, is a fact so obvious, that modern Utilitarians have recognized the impossibility of ignoring it after the manner of their predecessors; and Mr. Herbert Spencer has fully admitted that the ideas of the Right and the Useful are now entirely different, although they had once, he thinks, the same origin. But that the idea of the Right was ever potentially enwrapped or latent in the idea of the Useful, we entirely deny, seeing that it not only *overlaps* it altogether, and goes far beyond it in the direction of the Noble and the Holy, but that it is continually in direct antithesis to it; and acts of generosity and courage (such as Mr. Mill's resolution to go to hell rather than say an untruth) command from us admiration, not only apart from their utility, but *because* they set at defiance every principle of utility, and make us feel that to such men there are things dearer than eternal joy. As Mr. Mivart says well, the sentiment of all ages which has found expression in the cry, "Fiat Justitia ruat cœlum," could never have sprung from the same root as our sense of Utility.

Proceeding a step farther downward to the point wherewith alone Mr. Darwin concerns himself—the origin of such moral sense as recent Utilitarians grant that we possess—we come again on a huge field of controversy. Are our intuitions of all kinds, those, for instance, regarding space, numbers and moral distinctions, ultimate data of our mental constitution, ideas obtained by the *à-priori* action of the normally developed mind; or are they merely, as Mr. Hutton has paraphrased Mr. Spencer's theory, "a special susceptibility in our nerves produced by a vast number of homogeneous ancestral experiences agglutinated into a single intellectual tendency"? Is our sense of the necessity and universality of a truth (e.g., that the three sides of all

triangles in the universe are equal to two right angles), and the unhesitating certainty with which we affirm such universality, over and above any possible experience of generality,—is this sense, we say, the expression of pure Reason, or is it nothing but a blind incapacity for imagining as altered that which we have never seen or heard of as changed? Volumes deep and long as Kant's Kritik or Mr. Spencer's "Principles" are needed, if this question is to receive any justice at our hands. All that it is possible to do in passing onward to our remarks on Mr. Darwin's views, is to enter our protest against the admission of any such parentage either for mathematical or moral intuitions. No event in a man's mental development is, I think, more startling than his first clear apprehension of the nature of a geometrical demonstration, and of the immutable nature of the truth he has acquired, against which a thousand miracles would not avail to shake his faith. The hypothesis of the inheritance of space-intuitions through numberless ancestral experiments, leaves this marvellous sense of certainty absolutely inexplicable. And when we apply the same hypothesis of inheritance to moral intuitions, it appears to me to break down still more completely; supplying us at the utmost with a plausible theory for the explanation of our preference for some acts as more useful than others, but utterly failing to suggest a reason for that which is the real phenomenon to be accounted for, namely, our sense of the sacred obligation of Rightfulness, over and above or apart from Utility. Nay, what Mr. Mill calls the "mystical extension" of the idea of Utility into the idea of Right is not only left wholly unexplained, but the explanation offered points, not to any such mystical extension, but quite the other way. The waters of our moral life cannot possibly rise above their source; and if Utility be that source, they ought by this time to have settled into a dead pond of plain and acknowledged self-interestedness. As Mr. Hutton observes: "Mr. Spencer's theory appears to find the feeling of moral obligation at its maximum, when the perception of the quality which ultimately produces that feeling is at its minimum."

But we must now do Mr. Darwin the justice to let him speak for himself, and for the only part of the Utilitarian theory for which he has made himself directly responsible;

though his whole argument is so obviously founded solely on an Utilitarian basis, that we are tempted to doubt whether a mind so large, so just and so candid, can have ever added to its treasures of physical science the thorough mastery of any of the great works in which the opposite systems of ethics have been set forth.

Animals display affection, fidelity and sympathy. Man when he first rose above the Ape was probably of a social disposition, and lived in herds. Mr. Darwin adds that he would probably inherit a tendency to be faithful to his comrades, and have also some capacity for self-command, and a readiness to aid and defend his fellow-men.* These latter qualities, we must observe, do not agree very well with what Mr. Galton recently told us† of the result of his interesting studies of the cattle of South Africa, and at all events need that we should suppose the forefathers of our race to have united all the best moral as well as physical qualities of other animals. But assuming that so it may have been, Mr. Darwin says, Man's next motive, acquired by sympathy, would be the love of praise and horror of infamy. After this, as such feelings became clearer and reason advanced, he would "feel himself impelled, independently of any pleasure or pain felt at the moment, to certain lines of conduct. He may then say, I am the supreme judge of my own conduct; and, in the words of Kant, I will not in my own person violate the dignity of humanity."‡ That any savage or half-civilized man ever felt anything like this, or that the "dignity of humanity" could come in sight for endless generations of progress, conducted only in such ways as Mr. Darwin has suggested, nay, that it could ever occur at all to a creature who had not some higher conception of the nature of that Virtue in which man's only "dignity" consists, than Mr. Darwin has hinted,—is a matter, I venture to think, of gravest doubt.

But, again passing onward, we reach the first of our author's special theories; his doctrine of the nature of Repentance. Earnestly I wish to do it justice; for upon it hinges our theory of the nature of the moral sense. As our bodily sense of feeling can best be studied when we touch hard objects or shrink from a burn or a blow, so our spiri-

---

* P. 85. † Macmillan's Magazine, February, 1871. ‡ P. 86.

tual sense of feeling becomes most evident when it comes in contact with wrong, or recoils in the agony of remorse from a crime.

"Why"—it is Mr. Darwin who asks the question—"why should a man feel that he ought to obey one instinctive feeling rather than another? Why does he bitterly regret if he has yielded to the strong sense of self-preservation, and has not risked his life to save that of a fellow-creature?" The answer is, that in some cases the social or maternal instincts will always spur generous natures to unselfish deeds. But where such social instincts are less strong than the instincts of self-preservation, hunger, vengeance, &c., then these last are naturally paramount, and the question is pressed, "Why does man regret, even though he may endeavour to banish any such regret, that he has followed the one natural impulse rather than the other? and why does he further feel that he ought to regret his conduct?" Man in this respect differs, Mr. Darwin admits, profoundly from the lower animals, but he thinks he sees the reason of the difference. It is this: Man has reflection. From the activity of his mental qualities, he cannot help past impressions incessantly passing through his mind. The animals have no need to reflect; for those which have social instincts never quit the herd, and never fail to obey their kindly impulses. But man, though he has the same or stronger social impulses, has other, though more, temporary passions, such as hunger, vengeance, and the like, which obtain transient indulgence often at the expense of his kind. These, however, are all temporary in their nature. When hunger, vengeance, covetousness, or the desire for preservation, has been satisfied, such feelings not only fade, but it is impossible to recall their full vividness by an act of memory.

"Thus as man cannot prevent old impressions from passing through his mind, he will be compelled to compare the weaker impression of, for instance, past hunger, or of vengeance satisfied, with the instinct of sympathy and goodwill to his fellows which is still present, and ever in some degree active in his mind. He will then feel in his imagination that a stronger instinct has yielded to one which now seems comparatively weak, and then that sense of dissatisfaction will inevitably be felt with which man is endowed, like every other animal, in order that his instincts may be obeyed."*

* P. 90.

Leaving out for the present the last singular clause of this paragraph, which appears to point to a Cause altogether outside of the range of phenomena we are considering,—a Cause which, if it (or HE?) exist at all, may well "endow" human hearts more directly than through such dim animal instincts as are in question,—leaving out of view this hint of a Creator, we ask: Is this physiology of Repentance true to fact? It would be hard, I venture to think, to describe one more at variance with it. The reader might be excused who should figure to himself the author as a man who has never in his lifetime had cause seriously to regret a single unkindly or ignoble deed, and who has unconsciously attributed his own abnormally generous and placable nature to the rest of his species, and then theorized as if the world were made of Darwins. Where (we ask in bewilderment), where are the people to be found in whom "sympathy and goodwill" to all their neighbours exist in the state of permanent instincts, and whose resentful feelings, as a matter of course, die out after every little temporary exhibition, and leave them in charity with their enemies, *not* as the result of repentance, but as its preliminary? Where, O where, may we find the population for whom the precept, "Love your enemies," is altogether superfluous, and who always revert to affection as soon as they have gratified any transient sentiment of an opposite tendency? Hitherto we have been accustomed to believe that (as Buddhists are wont to insist) a kind action done to a foe is the surest way to enable ourselves to return to charitable feelings, and that, in like manner, doing him an ill-turn is calculated to exasperate our own rancour. We have held it as axiomatic that "revenge and wrong bring forth their kind;" and that we hate those whom we have injured with an ever-growing spite and cruelty as we continue to give our malice headway. But instead of agreeing with Tacitus that "*Humani generis proprium est odisse quem læseris*," Mr. Darwin actually supposes that as soon as ever we have delivered our blow, it is customary for us immediately to wish to wipe it off with a kiss! In what Island of the Blessed do people love all the way round their social circles, the mean and the vulgar, the disgusting and the tiresome, not excepted? If such beings are entirely exceptional now, when the careful husbandry of Christianity has been employed for eighteen

centuries in cultivating that virtue of mansuetude, of which the ancient world produced so limited a crop, how is it to be supposed that our hirsute and tusky progenitors of the Palæolithic or yet remoter age, were thoroughly imbued with such gentle sentiments? Let it be borne in mind that, unless the great majority of men, after injuring their neighbours, spontaneously turned to sympathize with them, there could not possibly be a chance for the foundation of a *general* sentiment such as Mr. Darwin supposes to grow up in the community.

This whole theory, then, of the origin of Repentance, namely, that it is the "innings" of our permanent social instincts when the transient selfish ones have played out their game, seems to be without basis on any known condition of human nature. Ostensibly raised on induction, it lacks the primary facts from which its inductions profess to be drawn; and Mr. Darwin, in offering it to us as the result of his studies in Natural History, has surely betrayed that he has observed other species of animals more accurately than his own; and that he has overlooked the vast class of intelligences which lie between baboons and philosophers.

The theory of the nature of Repentance which we have been considering, is a characteristic improvement on the current Utilitarian doctrine, in so far that it suggests a cause for the *human tenderness*, if I may so describe it, which forms one element in true repentance. If it were true of mankind in general (as it may be true of the most gentle individuals) that a return to sympathy and goodwill spontaneously follows, sooner or later, every unkind act, then Mr. Darwin's account of the case would supply us with an explanation of that side of the sentiment of repentance which is turned towards the person injured. It would still, I think, fail altogether to render an account of the mysterious awe and horror which the greater crimes have in all ages left on the minds of their perpetrators, far beyond any feelings of pity for the sufferers, and quite irrespective of fear of human justice or retaliation. This tremendous sentiment of Remorse, though it allies itself with religious fears, seems to me not so much to be derived from religious considerations as to be in itself one of the roots of religion. The typical Orestes does not feel horror because he fears

the Erinnyes, but he has called up the phantoms of the Erinnyes in the nightmare of his horror. Nothing which Mr. Darwin, or any other writer on his side, so far as I am aware, has ever suggested as the origin of the moral sense, has supplied us with a plausible explanation of either such Remorse or of ordinary Repentance. In the former case, we have soul-shaking terrors to be accounted for, either (according to Mr. Darwin) by mere pity and sympathy, or (according to the old Utilitarians) by fear of retaliation or disgrace, such as the sufferer often notoriously defies or even courts. In the case of ordinary Repentance, we have a feeling infinitely sacred and tender, capable of transforming our whole nature as by an enchanter's wand, softening and refreshing our hearts as the dry and dusty earth is quickened by an April shower, but yet (we are asked to believe) caused by no higher sorcery, fallen from no loftier sky, than our own every-day instincts, one hour selfish and the next social, asserting themselves in wearisome alternation! What is the the right of one of these instincts as against the other, that its resumption of its temporary supremacy should be accompanied by such portents of solemn augury? Why, when we return to love our neighbour, do we at the same time hate ourselves, and *wish* to do so still more? Why, instead of shrinking from punishment, do men, under such impressions, always desire to expiate their offences so fervently, that with the smallest sanction from their religious teachers they rush to the cloister or seize the scourge? Why, above all, do we look inevitably beyond the fellow-creature whom we have injured up to God, and repeat the cry which has burst from every penitent heart for millenniums back, "Against Thee, Thee only, have I sinned!"

Putting aside the obvious fact that the alleged cause of repentance could, at the utmost, only explain repentance for social wrong-doing, and leave inexplicable the equally bitter grief for personal offences, we find, then, that it fails even on its own ground. To make it meet approximately the facts of the case, we want something altogether different. We want to be told, not only why we feel sorry for our neighbour when we have wronged him, but how we come by the profound sense of a Justice which our wrong has infringed, and which we yet revere so humbly, that we often prefer to suffer that it may be vindicated. Of all this, the

Utilitarian scheme, with Mr. Darwin's additions, affords not the vaguest indication.

I cannot but think that, had any professed psychologist dealt thus with the mental phenomena which it was his business to explain, had he first assumed that we returned to benevolent feelings spontaneously after injuring our neighbours, and then presented such relenting as the essence of repentance, few readers would have failed to notice the disproportion between the unquestionable facts and their alleged cause. But when a great natural philosopher weaves mental phenomena into his general theory of physical development, it is to be feared that many a student will hastily accept a doctrine which seems to fit neatly enough into a system he adopts as a whole; even though it could find on its own merits no admission into a scheme of psychology. The theory of Morals which alone ought to command our adhesion must surely be one not like this, harmonizing only with one side of our philosophy, but equally true to all the facts of the case, whether we regard them from without or from within, whether we study Man, *ab extra*, as one animal amongst all the tribes of zoology, or from within by the experience of our own hearts. From the outside, it is obvious that the two human sentiments of Regret and Repentance may very easily be confounded. A theory which should account for Regret might be supposed to cover the facts of Repentance, did no inward experience of the difference forbid us to accept it. But since Coleridge pointed out this loose link in the chain of Utilitarian argument, no disciple of the school has been able to mend it; and even Mr. Darwin's theory only supplies an hypothesis for the origin of relenting Pity, not one for Penitence. Let us suppose two simple cases: first, that in an accident at sea, while striving eagerly to help a friend, we had unfortunately caused his death; second, that in the same contingency, an impulse of jealousy or anger had induced us purposely to withhold from him the means of safety. What would be our feelings in the two cases? In the first, we should feel Regret which, however deep and poignant, would never be anything else than simple Regret, and which, if it assumed the slightest tinge of self-reproach, would be instantly rebuked by every sound-minded spectator as morbid and unhealthy. In the second

case (assuming that we had perfect security against discovery of our crime), we should feel, perhaps, very little Regret, but we should endure Remorse to the end of our days; we should carry about in our inner hearts a shadow of fear and misery and self-reproach which would make us evermore alone amid our fellows. Now, will Mr. Darwin, or any other thinker who traces the origin of the Moral Sense to the "agglutinated" experience of utility of a hundred generations, point out to us how that experience can possibly have bequeathed to us the latter sentiment of Remorse for a crime, as contra-distinguished from that of Regret for having unintentionally caused a misfortune?

But if the origin of repentance, in the case of obvious capital injuries to our neighbour, cannot be accounted for merely as the result of ancestral experience, it appears still more impossible to account in the same way for the moral shame which attaches to many lesser offences, whose noxiousness is by no means self-evident, which no legislation has ever made penal, and which few religions have condemned. Mr. Wallace, in his Contributions to the Theory of Natural Selection, appears to me to sum up this argument admirably.* After explaining how very inadequate are the Utilitarian sanctions for Truthfulness, and observing how many savages yet make veracity a point of honour, he says: "It is difficult to conceive that such an intense and mystical feeling of right and wrong (so intense as to overcome all ideas of personal advantage or utility) could have been developed out of accumulated ancestral experiences of utility; but still more difficult to understand how feelings developed by one set of utilities could be transferred to acts of which the utility was partial, imaginary or absent"—or (as he might justly have added) so remote as to be quite beyond the ken of uncivilized or semi-civilized man. It is no doubt a fact that, in the long run, Truthfulness contributes more than Lying to the Greatest Happiness of the Greatest Number. But to discover that fact needs a philosopher, not a savage. Other virtues, such as that of care for the weak and aged, seem still less capable, as Mr. Mivart has admirably shewn,† of being evolved out of a sense of utility, seeing that savages and

---

* P. 355. † Genesis of Species, p. 192.

animals find it much the most useful practice to kill and devour such sufferers, and, by the law of the Survival of the Fittest, all nature below civilized man is arranged on the plan of so doing. Mr. W. R. Greg's very clever paper in Fraser's Magazine, pointing out how Natural Selection fails in the case of man in consequence of our feelings of pity for the weak, affords incidentally the best possible proof that human society is based on an element which has no counterpart in the utility which rules the animal world.

It would be doing Mr. Darwin injustice if we were to quit the consideration of his observations on the nature of Repentance, leaving on the reader's mind the impression that he has put them forward formally as delineating an exhaustive theory of the matter, or that he has denied, otherwise than by implication, the doctrine that higher and more spiritual influences enter into the phenomena of the moral life. The absence of the slightest allusion to any such higher sources of moral sentiment leaves, however, on the reader's mind a very strong impression that here we are supposed to rest. The developed Ape has acquired a moral sense by adaptive changes of mental structure precisely analogous to those adaptive changes of bodily structure which have altered his foot and rolled up his ear. To seek for a more recondite source for the one class of changes than for the other would be arbitrary and unphilosophical.

But now we come to the last, and, as it seems to me, the saddest doctrine of all. Our moral sense, however acquired, does not, it is asserted, correspond to anything real outside of itself, to any law which must be the same for all Intelligences, mundane or supernal. It merely affords us a sort of Ready Reckoner for our particular wages, a Rule of Thumb for our special work, in the position in which we find ourselves just at present. That I may do Mr. Darwin no injustice, I shall quote his observations on this point in his own words.

"It may be well first to premise that I do not wish to maintain that any strictly social animal, if its intellectual faculties were to become as active and as highly developed as in man, would acquire exactly the same moral sense as ours....If, for instance, to take an extreme case, men were reared precisely under the same conditions as hive-bees, there can hardly be a doubt that our unmarried females would, like the worker-bees,

think it a sacred duty to kill their brothers, and mothers would strive to kill their fertile daughters, and no one would think of interfering. Nevertheless, the bee, or any other social animal, would in our supposed case gain, as it appears to me, some feeling of right and wrong, or a conscience. For each individual would have an inward sense of possessing certain stronger or more enduring instincts, and others less strong or enduring; so that there would often be a struggle which impulse should be followed, and satisfaction or dissatisfaction would be felt as past impressions were compared during their incessant passage through the mind. In this case, an inward monitor would tell the animal that it would have been better to have followed the one impulse rather than the other. The one course ought to have been followed. The one would have been right and the other wrong."*

Now it is a little difficult to clear our minds on this subject of the mutable or immutable in morals. No believer in the immutability of morality holds that it is any *physical* act itself which is immutably right, but only the *principles* of Benevolence, Truth, and so on, by which such acts must be judged. The parallel between Ethics and Geometry here holds strictly true. The axioms of both sciences are necessary truths known to us as facts of consciousness. The subordinate propositions are deduced from such axioms by reflection. The application of the propositions to the actual circumstances of life is effected by a process (sometimes called "traduction") by which all applied sciences become practically available. For example, Geometry teaches us that a triangle is equal to half a rectangle upon the same base and with the same altitude, but no geometry can teach us whether a certain field be a triangle with equal base and altitude to the adjoining rectangle. To know this we must measure both, and then we shall know that if such be their proportions, the one will contain half as much space as the other. Similarly in morals, Intuition teaches us to "Love our Neighbour," and reflection will thence deduce that we ought to relieve the wants of the suffering. But no ethics can teach A what are the special wants of B, or how they can best be supplied. According, then, to the doctrines of Intuitive Morality, considerations of Utility have a most important, though altogether subordinate, place in ethics.

---

* Descent of Man, pp. 33, 34.

It is the office of experience to shew us *how* to put the mandates of intuition into execution, though not to originate our moral code,—*how* to fulfil the duty of conferring Happiness, though not to set up Happiness as the sole end and aim of Morality.

Now if Mr. Darwin had simply said that under totally different conditions of life many of the existing human duties would have been altered, we could have no possible fault to find with his remarks. In a world where nobody needed food there could be no duty of feeding the hungry; in a world of immortals there could be no such crime as murder. Every alteration in circumstance produces a certain variation in moral obligation, for the plain reason (as above stated) that Morals only supply abstract principles, and, according to the circumstances of each case, their application must necessarily vary. If the triangular field have a rood cut off it, or a rood added on, it will no longer be the half of the rectangle beside it. It would not be difficult to imagine a state of existence in which the immutable principles of Benevolence would require quite a different set of actions from those which they now demand; in fact, no one supposes that among the Blessed, where they will rule all hearts, they will inspire any such manifestations as they call for on earth.

But Mr. Darwin's doctrine seems to imply something very different indeed from this. He thinks (if I do not mistake him) that, under altered circumstances, human beings would have acquired consciences in which not only the *acts* of social duty would have been different, but its *principles* would have been transformed or reversed. It is obviously impossible to stretch our conception of the principle of Benevolence so far as should enable us to include under its possible manifestations the conduct of the worker bees to the drones; and I suppose few of us have hitherto reflected on this and similar strange phenomena of natural history, without falling back with relief on the reflection that the animal, devoid of moral sense, does its destructive work as guiltlessly as the storm or the flood.

On Mr. Darwin's system, the developed bee would have an "inward monitor" actually prompting the murderous sting, and telling her that such a course "*ought* to have been followed." The Danaïdes of the hive, instead of the

eternal nightmare to which Greek imagination consigned them, would thus receive the reward of their assassinations in the delights of the *mens conscia recti*; or, as Mr. Darwin expresses it, by the satisfaction of "the stronger and more enduring instinct." Hitherto we have believed that the human moral sense, though liable to sad oscillations under the influence of false religion and education, yet points normally to one true Pole. Now we are called on to think there is no pole at all, and that it may swing all round the circle of crimes and virtues, and be equally trustworthy whether it point north, south, east or west. In brief, there are no such things really as Right and Wrong; and our idea that they have existence outside of our own poor little minds is pure delusion.

The bearings of this doctrine on Morality and on Religion seem to be equally fatal. The all-embracing Law which alone could command our reverence has disappeared from the universe; and God, if He exist, may, for aught we can surmise, have for Himself a code of Right in which every cruelty and every injustice may form a part, quite as probably as the opposite principles.

Does such an hypothesis actually fit any of the known facts of human consciousness? Is there anywhere to be found an indication of the supposed possibility of acquiring a conscience in which the *principles* of Right and Wrong should be transformed, as well as their application altered? It would seem (as already alluded to) that, as a matter of fact, the utility of destroying old people and female infants has actually appeared so great to many savage and semi-civilized people, as to have caused them to practice such murders in a systematic way for thousands of years. But we have never been told that the Fuegians made it more than a matter of good sense to eat their grandfathers, or that the Chinese, when they deposited their drowned babies in the public receptacles labelled "For Toothless Infants," did so with the proud consciousness of fulfilling one of those time-hallowed Rites of which they are so fond. The transition from a sense of Utility to a sense of Moral Obligation seems to be one which has never yet been observed in human history. Mr. Darwin himself, with his unvarying candour, remarks that no instance is known of an arbitrary or superstitious practice, though

pursued for ages, leaving hereditary tendencies of the nature of a moral sense. Of course where a religious sanction is believed to elevate any special act (such as Sabbath-keeping) into an express tribute of homage to God, it justly assumes in the conscience precisely the place such homage should occupy. But even here the world-old distinction between offences against such arbitrary laws, *mala prohibita*, and those against the eternal laws of morals, *mala in se*, has never been wholly overlooked.

I think, then, we are justified in concluding that the moral history of mankind, so far as we know it, gives no countenance to the hypothesis that Conscience is the result of certain contingencies in our development, and that it might at an earlier stage have been moulded into quite another form, causing Good to appear to us Evil, and Evil Good. I think we have a right to say that the suggestions offered by the highest scientific intellects of our time, to account for its existence on principles which shall leave it on the level of other instincts, have failed to approve themselves as true to the facts of the case. And I think, therefore, that we are called on to believe still in the validity of our own moral consciousness, even as we believe in the validity of our other faculties, and to rest in the faith (well-nigh universal) of the human race, in a fixed and supreme Law, of which the Will of God is the embodiment, and Conscience the Divine transcript. I think that we may still repeat the hymn of Cleanthes:

> "That our wills blended into Thine
> (Concurrent in the Law divine,
> Eternal, universal, just and good),
> Honouring and honoured in our servitude,
> Creation's Pæan march may swell,
> The march of Law immutable,
> Wherein, as to its noblest end,
> All being doth for ever tend."

FRANCES POWER COBBE.

IV.—JOHN WESLEY.—I.

The Life and Times of the Rev. John Wesley, M.A., Founder of the Methodists. By the Rev. L. Tyerman. Vols. I. and II. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1870.

John Wesley and the Evangelical Reaction of the Eighteenth Century. By Julia Wedgwood. London: Macmillan and Co. 1870.

John Wesley's Place in Church History determined, with the aid of Facts and Documents unknown to, or unnoticed by, his Biographers. By R. Denny Urlin. Rivingtons: London, Oxford and Cambridge. 1870.

I AM desirous of making known some thoughts which I entertain about John Wesley. I wish to do so, because what I have to say is not likely to be said by any one else; and the present seems a favourable time for saying it, on account of the general attention which is now directed to Mr. Wesley's character and work. My interest in all relating to him has, throughout my life, been of the strongest kind; and I have acquainted myself, according to my opportunities, from time to time, with whatever has been written concerning him. In my younger days, I was not only intimately connected with Methodism, but specially favoured with means of acquiring a traditional knowledge of Mr. Wesley. I lived in the house of Mr. Henry Moore, one of his literary executors, and his biographer, and I am in possession of such information as a close friendship with Mr. Moore would naturally supply. I cannot help saying, as I pass along, that Mr. Moore, for depth of thought and strength of purpose, was one of the finest men I have ever known. In these, and in some other respects, he was a giant in his day. He could express the reality and intensity of religious feeling with a power hardly to be conceived of till it was felt. His Life of Wesley, though somewhat heavy, is superior to every other in the religious representation it contains. I have modified the impressions he conveyed to me, but my views still bear witness to the influence of his statements and opinions. I must, in what I may advance, presume upon a general knowledge of the facts of Mr. Wesley's life. I do not set myself to tell his story, but to

give my idea of the true meaning and use of the story, as it has been often told by others. I have frequently before had occasion to speak of Mr. Wesley; and I may, in some instances, repeat the substance of former efforts. It is not my intention, however, to do so; and I shall entirely abstain from consulting anything I have already written. The danger of disagreement with myself may be therefore as imminent as is that of reiteration. I am almost ashamed of this personal introduction, and I would blot it out, if I did not think it was necessary to explain what might otherwise appear an improper assurance in my method of treating my subject.

From the time of the Reformation to that of the Act of Uniformity, the distinctively religious influence in England was what is commonly called Puritanism. I speak only of the general stream of popular religion, and am ready to allow for any amount of individual instances of true piety which may be established in connection with other influences. The statement I have made will be accepted or rejected by others, as they agree with or differ from me as to what I understand by religion. I understand by it, that personal cultivation of the relations between God and man, which makes the principle of divine fear the ruling power of the life. I put aside all questions of opinion or administration, and look only to the formation of character. In that essential respect I feel assured that the Puritans were, pre-eminently, the religious people of our country during the period to which I have referred. They were not a sect separated from the National Church, at any part of this period. They existed within the pale of that Church throughout all its changes. They formed a body of men who endeavoured, with more or less success, to engraft their views and practices upon the Episcopalian constitution of things; and, when Presbyterianism or Independency prevailed, they availed themselves of those institutions for the fulfilment of their characteristic purposes. Between these purposes and Presbyterianism or Independency there was a greater sympathy than there was between them and Episcopalianism; but it was not the Presbyterianism or Independency, any more than it was the Episcopalianism, which, of itself, expressed such purposes. The purposes were religious, not ecclesiastical. Nay, further: though certain theo-

logical conclusions stood more intimately connected with Puritan life than any church organization did, it was the life, rather than the theology, which gave to Puritanism its peculiar nature and power.

The Act of Uniformity was the origin of formal Dissent. The passing of that Act produced two distinct ecclesiastical parties in the country: one consisting of those who adhered to the Established Church, and the other of those who separated themselves from that Church. The separatists carried away with them, in a very large measure, the Puritan element which had before leavened the whole mass of religious profession. Nothing is more marked, in the time between the Restoration and the Revolution, than the fact, that everything like deep and earnest religion was, for the most part, confined to those congregations and individuals who were not in communion with the Church of England. That Church suffered miserably by its change of relation, as far as religion was concerned. It became more intensely secular than it had ever been before. There were other causes, besides the separation I have noticed, which contributed to this effect. The licentiousness of manners which came in like a flood with the restored monarchy, was one of the most prominent of those causes. The result was, that, in spite of some remarkable instances of powerful preaching and writing, which redeemed the character of the established administration, but which may themselves be considered as the reflection of a former age, Piety, in any strength of exercise or extent of operation, had become nearly the monopoly of those whom the authorized representatives of religion persecuted and endeavoured to destroy. The exceptions to this rule that we meet with, shine out in contrast to the general state of things around them.

After the Revolution of 1688, another change in the religious condition of the nation occurred. Morally, the Church of England remained much as it had been under the reigns of the two last Stuarts, but the theology taught assumed a more rationalistic character. This tendency affected the Dissenting communities also, so that their religious manifestations lost much of the Puritan character formerly belonging to them. Where the movement towards rationalism was resisted, a hard Calvinism was adopted, as the strongest bulwark of such resistance; but, however effective it might

be for that purpose, it contributed little to the free development of the religious life. This period was, therefore, worse, in its relation to such life, than the period of bitter trial which immediately preceded it. There are some striking evidences of this being the case. What earnest religion existed assumed a mystical form, in distinction from any of the common theologies of the time. Persons belonging to the Church of England who were desirous of fostering among themselves a devotion to the interests of piety, united in "Religious Societies" separate from the existing organizations; those societies being a peculiar institution that met a new want. The opposition which the first Methodists had to encounter at Oxford, proved, what would have been incredible in theory, that mere strictness in religious observances, and activity in works of benevolence, were there regarded as signs of madness. It is, moreover, very significant, that when Wesley and Whitfield began their reformation, though they had but little violent antagonism to encounter from Nonconformists, they found scarcely so much sympathy among them as they did among Churchmen. There are direct testimonies, powerful enough and numerous enough to establish the conclusion at which I am aiming; but these undeniable facts speak louder than any declarations can do, in favour of the irreligious character of the beginning of the last century, and the necessity there was for some angel to descend and trouble the waters before the people could be spiritually healed.

If any one, living at the time of which I am speaking, had taken into account the course of events that has just passed under our notice, he would be naturally led to adopt the opinion, that a religious revival in England would, in all probability, take its rise from circumstances which fanned into a flame the old Puritan fire that was smouldering in ashes. It would scarcely have seemed possible that such a revival should spring up within the pale of the Church of England. There would, indeed, have been the fact, that "the Religious Societies" I have mentioned, consisted of members of that Church; but those societies were not likely to have been regarded as of much importance in the estimate I have imagined. It is singular to mark how this estimate is at once confirmed and contradicted by the events which actually happened. It was in

the Church of England that Methodism originated, and among members of that Church distinguished for their high Anglican views. Stricter Anglicans than old Samuel Wesley and his wife could scarcely be found; and their children trod, in this respect, in the steps of their parents. John Wesley, for instance, got into very hot water in America, by his dogged adherence to ritualistic observances; and he said of himself, "I should have thought the saving of souls almost a sin if it had not been done in a church."* But both the parents of the Wesley family were immediately descended from Puritans. The respective fathers of each, were Ejected Ministers of the most decided Puritan type. John Wesley, the father of Samuel, was a bold and severe specimen of the class to which he belonged. There is a well-known dialogue between him and the Bishop of Bristol, which on his part is so like what his grandson John might, under similar circumstances, have uttered, that it cannot be read without a humorous smile of recognition. In mental and moral respects, the chip answers to the block, though the block was a very close-grained piece of anti-churchism indeed. Dr. Annesley, the father of Mrs. Samuel Wesley, was distinguished among his fellows for the piety of his life and the success of his ministry. We have here nothing to do with the causes which led the children of these lights of the Dissenting world, to turn their backs upon the ancestral home, and take shelter in the house of bondage from which their parents had, at great risks and sacrifices, escaped. But whatever might have been the effect of the ecclesiastical transition they thus underwent, they carried into their episcopal refuge all the steadfastness and fervour of religious principle by which their forefathers were distinguished; and the parsonage at Epworth shone brightly, among the other parsonages in the country, as a spot where Puritan manners and habits added a higher spiritual worth to the decent order and respectable footing of an Anglican ministry.

There were other peculiarities in this Wesley family besides its decidedly religious character. Samuel, the head of it, was a man of considerable distinction. His literary labours were immense. His son John did but reflect the

---

* Southey's Life of Wesley, edition 1858, Vol. I. p. 149.

father's skill and diligence in composition. It is curious to observe how similar their productions were in style and in purpose. A singular aptitude for abridging large and valuable works for popular use belonged to them both. "The Young Student's Library" of the one, was modelled exactly after "The Christian Library" of the other. The father was, moreover, conspicuous and influential in connection with the Church affairs of his day. He strenuously fought against Dissenters. He actively supported High-church movements. He was a busy member of Convocation. But his temper was not so amiable as his conduct was zealous. He was undoubtedly a good man, but he was a hard and obstinate one. In his concern for public matters he neglected his domestic duties, and he mismanaged his pecuniary affairs so as to be continually in debt. He had, indeed, to suffer imprisonment for debt; and nothing appeared to prosper in his hands. The misfortunes of his worldly lot were not counterbalanced by the love with which his spiritual labours were regarded. His flock turned against their shepherd. Twice, if not three times, they set his house on fire; and the famous story of the ghost by which that house was haunted, is most reasonably explained on the principle that caused the fires. His relations to his wife were not of the most comfortable kind. She herself said to her son John, "It is an unhappiness almost peculiar to our family, that your father and I seldom think alike."* And her son Samuel said, "Would to God my father and mother were as easy in one another as my wife and I are."† When the wife was detected by the husband in omitting to say "Amen" at the end of the prayers for William III., he left her, and did not correspond with her till after the king's death. She was, however, superior to him in power of will, as in most other things. Her letters to him in defence of a Sunday-evening service which she conducted in the house when he was absent attending Convocation, prove that he could not generally have had the best of it in the disputes between them. He left the education of their children to a great degree in her hands; and she was a most assiduous and successful instructor. Her discipline

* Tyerman's Life of John Wesley, Vol. I. p. 32.

† Wedgwood's John Wesley, p. 11.

was very severe, but it was conducted with the clearest views, and directed to the noblest ends. She treated her children rather as machines than as creatures of sense and passion; but she evidently won their highest reverence, and to her direct influence upon their characters, much of the form as well as the spirit of the Methodist movement to which her sons gave birth, is to be attributed. Every addition to our knowledge of her increases the idea of her intellectual cultivation and moral excellence; and as we read such an account as the following, which appears in a letter to her brother, our pity for her even exceeds our admiration:

"I am rarely in health. Mr. Wesley declines apace. My dear Emily, who in my present exigences would exceedingly comfort me, is compelled to go to service in Lincoln, where she is a teacher in a boarding-school. My second daughter, Suky, a pretty woman and worthy of a better fate, when, by your last unkind letters, she perceived that all her hopes in you were frustrated, rashly threw herself away upon a man, if a man he can be called, that is little inferior to the apostate angels in wickedness, that is not only her plague, but a constant affliction to the family. O sir! O brother! happy, thrice happy are you! happy is my sister that buried your children in infancy!..... Believe me, sir, it is better to mourn ten children dead than one living; and I have buried many. But here I must pause awhile. The other children, though wanting neither industry nor capacity for business, we cannot put to any, by reason we have neither money nor friends to assist us in doing it.....Innumerable are other uneasinesses, too tedious to mention, insomuch that with my own indisposition, my master's infirmities, the absence of my eldest, the ruin of my second daughter, and the inconceivable distress of all the rest, I have enough to turn a head stronger than mine."*

In this home John Wesley was brought up, and the influence upon him of its special characteristics may be distinctly traced. Besides the literary facility which he inherited from his father, his scholastic taste would be well cultivated under that father's example. If his talents were his father's, his disposition was his mother's; and her strict adherence to order and faithful discharge of duty would make him the conscientious disciplinarian he became.

* Moore's Life of Wesley, Vol. I. p. 566.

Narrow means and cruel misfortunes would strengthen his native tendency to careful and industrious independence. He would meet with little to draw forth his affections with warmth, but he would find much to excite him to serious reflection. Above all, he would be taught to regard every matter which presented itself to his thought, in the light of religion, and to cultivate piety as a necessary, though not a joyful exercise. Growth depends upon the soil as well as the seed; and, though his brothers might and did partake of these influences in their degree, his more congenial nature would fit him for a fuller participation than belonged to them. His mother seems, from the first, to have appreciated the treasure she had obtained in this the most distinguished of her sons. "I do intend," she declared before God, "to be more particularly careful of the soul of this child, that thou hast so mercifully provided for, than ever I have been, that I may do my endeavour to instil into his mind the principles of thy true religion and virtue."*

Two marked features of his nature very early appeared. One was a pervading use of the logical faculty. "Child," said his father to him, "you think to carry everything by dint of argument; but you will find how little is ever done in the world by close reasoning."† Another feature was a love of superiority. When one of the masters of the Charterhouse caught him haranguing a lot of the lower schoolboys over whom he had constituted himself leader, and put to him the question, why he did not associate with his equals, he replied, "Better to reign in hell than serve in heaven."‡ A disputatious and dominant young gentleman of this kind was well fitted to enter the world as a reformer of its abuses, and an authoritative instructor of mankind.

I pass on to the Oxford life of the founder of Methodism. He entered that University as a student of Christ Church College, having been elected from the Charterhouse. It may be asked how his education could have been provided for, considering the poverty which his mother pleads. The answer is, that his elder brother, who was at this time one of the masters of Westminster School, assisted in this work. "You have been," wrote old to young Samuel,

---

* Moore's Life of Wesley, Vol. I. p. 116.

† Tyerman's Life of J. Wesley, Vol. I. p. 18. ‡ Ibid. p. 20.

"a father to your brothers and sisters, especially the former, who have cost you great sums in their education, both before and since they went to the University."* Still the young man had a hard struggle for support, and the Epworth resources were drained to the last penny. He became Fellow of Lincoln College very early, and while there was chosen Greek Lecturer and Moderator of the classes. After his ordination he served his father as a curate; and, on being recalled to Oxford, acted as a tutor.

It was during his absence as his father's assistant that the germ of the first Methodist society was planted in Oxford by his brother Charles; and on his return he joined the company as its acknowledged head. For this position he had the highest qualifications. His learning and talents made him conspicuous among his fellows. His influence over others, and his skill in organization; his more than military power of direction and command, and his entire devotedness to the spiritual purposes entertained, supplied the necessary stability and momentum to the association of which he took charge. He kept its members together by the rules he instituted. He stepped forward first himself in obedience to every call of duty. He invigorated the courage of his adherents by his superiority to ridicule and opposition. He shrank from no labour or privation by which the full effect of his position could be secured. He eagerly seized every opportunity of benevolent exertion that might consolidate into action the theory which he and his friends had adopted. Thus he was the veritable leader of those with whom he acted. His brother Charles and he were most intimately united, so that one was like the double of the other; but in explanation of this it is said that Charles "followed his brother entirely."† This must have been the order of things. With all his humility, John took the ruling office as that which belonged to him as a matter of course. He felt his own fitness for it, while he submitted to the wish of others in the case. One of his Oxford companions used often to say, with truth I have no doubt, that "his brother Wesley was naturally and habitually a tutor, and would be so to the end of the chapter."‡ We may,

---

* Tyerman's Life of Samuel Wesley, p. 417.

† Moore's Life of Wesley, Vol. I. p. 239.

‡ Hampson's Life of Wesley, Vol. III. p. 37.

indeed, imagine that if he was opposed he would display his sense of superiority somewhat harshly. When he went home, for instance, he was not very patiently obeyed; and it is his own story, that he carried the faith he had imbibed from Law, into his family in such a manner as seemed to turn the house upside down. "Never," said he, "did I see my mother so moved. Upon one occasion she said, with more appearance of anger than ever I saw in her before, *Shall I be taught by a boy!*" "But his father exerted a more sturdy resistance; and when the son, from the height of his mystic elevation, would enforce the purity which he had learned from his contemplative friend, the old man desired him to get out of the house with his apostolical nostrums."*

We cannot conceive too strongly of the entire religious devotedness which John Wesley at this time cultivated. Religion became the one study and business of his life. He was willing to give up everything else to its interests. "Shall I," said he, "quite break off my pursuit of all learning but what immediately tends to practice? I once desired to make a fair show in languages and philosophy; but it is past: there is a more excellent way; and if I cannot attain to any progress in the one, without throwing up all thoughts of the other, why, fare it well: yet a little while, and we shall all be equal in knowledge, if we are in virtue."† He was as fully pious during his Oxford life as he was at any subsequent period. There has been a great deal of talk as to whether he was then converted or not. He dated his conversion as happening after his return from Georgia, and Methodist writers have followed him in so doing. We think this a great mistake. It arises from measuring his relations to religion by his relations to certain dogmatic conceptions of Christianity. Both he and his followers interpreted his experience according to the necessities of their doctrinal theory. But a broader survey includes the two manifestations, in Oxford and in London, under the same religious representation. I do not at all deny the importance of the change which occurred when his views of the Christian salvation became conformed to what is called the Evangeli-

---

* Moore's Life of Wesley, Vol. I. p. 106.

† Watson's Life of Wesley, p. 30.

cal system; but I do deny that the line which separates his converted from his unconverted character, should be drawn where those views took the place of his former ones. I deny this as far as conversion is understood to mark a man's experimental acquaintance with religion in its true Christian form. He was a Christian in the highest sense of the term when he presided over the Holy Club, as certainly as he was when he began to gather the Methodist societies together. The accidents of his condition became different, the substance of it remained unaltered. This comparison holds good with regard to what had gone before his Oxford course, in the character of hereditary piety, as well as with regard to what followed after, in connection with his Evangelical experience. The strong desire which Mr. Wesley had to identify a Christian conversion with such an experience as involved the adoption of the peculiarities of his Christian belief, is frequently to be observed, under circumstances which convey the idea of very glaring mistake. When Samuel, the younger, died (though his death happened after only four hours' illness; and he had a few days before strongly expressed himself, in a letter to his mother, against the Methodist movement; and had been engaged within the previous month in a contention with his brother on the question of assurance), John wrote in his journal, "We could not but rejoice at hearing, from one who had attended my brother in all his weakness, that several days before he went hence, God had given him a calm and full assurance of his interest in Christ. O may every one that opposes it be thus convinced that this doctrine is of God!"* When his mother died, he and his brother Charles put upon her tombstone the following lines, than which nothing could be more inappropriate to the real character she had sustained.

"True daughter of affliction, she,
Inured to pain and misery,
Mourned a long night of griefs and fears,
A legal night of seventy years.
The Father then revealed his Son,
Him in the broken bread made known:
She knew and felt her sins forgiven,
And found the earnest of her heaven."†

---

* Wesley's Works, Vol. I. p. 250.

† Moore's Life of Wesley, Vol. I. p. 563.

I suppose these instances of a determination to accommodate facts to theory can scarcely be exceeded. The sources of Wesley's religious inspiration when at Oxford were such works as à Kempis's Imitation of Christ, Taylor's Holy Living, and Law's Serious Call. The religious philosophy of these works was not that on which his Puritan predecessors were nourished; but though the food was otherwise dressed, the vitality and vigour supplied were as marked in the one case as in the other. The Anglican ascetic was as truly devout as had been the Presbyterian or Independent saints.

It is deeply interesting to mark how, while thus endeavouring to serve God with all his soul and strength, young Wesley leaned upon his mother for support and guidance. It is from his correspondence with her that our knowledge of his feelings and purposes, under the circumstances with which we are now concerned, is mainly derived. He recognized in her a counsellor with whom no other could be compared, and she proved herself more than equal to every burden he thus imposed upon her. Her clear, calm and earnest judgments lift her to a high rank among those honourable women to whom the Church in all ages has owed so much of its light and heat.

We have the means of forming a correct idea of John Wesley's appearance and manners, as well as of his mental qualifications and moral repute, at this stage of his life. He was small, but remarkably well built. Indeed, the whole family seem to have been short of stature. His complexion was very fair and fresh, his countenance had great vivacity of expression, and his movements were active and quick. On first coming to Oxford, he was admired for his wit and gaiety. He had, however, always something of authority in his look; and when he became noted for seriousness of behaviour, he alarmed men by the earnestness of his proposals. He went straight to the performance of what he thought to be duty, however strange it might be, as though it were the most natural thing to be done; and he took upon himself onerous engagements without respect to any consideration but the impulse of doing good according to his opportunities. His speech was direct and frank, and his style of writing simple and full of point. "He had," said Mr. Gambold, from whose account some of the particulars

just noticed are drawn, "he had naturally a very clear apprehension, yet his exact prudence depended more on his humility and singleness of heart."* The reference to his piety by the same writer is still more impressive. "He thought prayer to be more his business than anything else; and I have seen him come out of his closet with a serenity of countenance that was next to shining. It discovered what he had been doing, and gave me double hope of receiving wise directions in the matter about which I came to consult him. In all his motions he attended to the will of God."† It is but right to add what is further said on the subject of the deference that was paid to him by his friends: "He never assumed anything to himself above his companions: any of them might speak their mind, and their words were as strictly regarded by him as his words were by them."‡

Mr. Wesley broke up his Oxford life in order to go out as a missionary to Georgia. He had previously resisted the wish of his family that he should succeed his father as rector of Epworth. The impression entertained of the inflexible determination belonging to him comes out very strongly in connection with this resistance. His brother Samuel, when alluding to his having declared that he would not accept the living, says: "After this declaration, I believe that no one can move your mind but Him who made it."§ We cannot, however, wonder at his conduct on this occasion. Such a position as that of parson of a country parish could not harmonize with the views he entertained of the work to which he was called. His sense of power and his experience of success must have led him to look for a wider sphere of exertion, and his ascetic habits alienated him from those methods of ministerial employment which the common circumstances around him presented. In Georgia he expected to have full scope for his energies, and to be freed from those conventional hindrances which an established religious society cast in his way. Alas! he was fearfully disappointed. His efforts were confined within very narrow limits indeed, and the society into which he was thrown was more artificial than that he

---

* Moore's Life of Wesley, Vol. I. p. 240.
† Ibid. p. 242.
‡ Ibid. p. 240.
§ Ibid. p. 212.

had left in England. He could not have been satisfied even with his own behaviour as to matters in which his self-denial was tried. He was publicly accused, instead of being reverentially submitted to. Much of his trouble arose from the fact that he was considered by others to be troublesome. What was still worse, he found the religious theory which he went out to promulgate, altogether inapplicable to the wants with which he had to deal, and lost his faith in the principles on which he had built his hope of success. No Tractarian neophyte of the present day could have been more pertinacious in insisting upon the forms of the Church, than he was. He introduced innovations of his own, just as High-church clergymen now do, and, like them, he regarded all other innovations with priestly horror: but he found that in this way he could not extend his influence. His theology was of that type which, preserving a firm belief in orthodoxy, yet resolves the cultivation of religion into spiritual reflection and discipline: but he found, mainly through his intercourse with some Moravians with whom he met, that what he was brought to consider as the essential nature of faith, had entirely escaped his notice. He placed a sure reliance upon the purity and sufficiency of that consecration to the divine service for which he had made so many sacrifices; but he found that this dependence was no absolute security against temptation, and did not deliver him from the fear of death. This was truly a mournful state of things. It resulted in preparing for that religious and ecclesiastical transformation which took place in him after he returned to his native land. That was, indeed, the true moral significance of his Georgian mission. It formed the great turning-point of his life. What he had suffered, shook his attachment to the Churchism in which he had been educated, and brought home to him a deep sense of the doctrinal deficiency of the Christianity he had adopted. He was thus made ready for the reception of the influences by which his future course was directed. It is in this sense that we take his own words as true, though it be a different one from that in which he used them—"It is upwards of two years since I left my native country, in order to teach the Georgia Indians the nature of Christianity. But what have I learned myself in the mean time? Why, what I least of all expected: that I, who went to

America to convert others, was never converted myself."* If conversion means the relation of man to God, this is wrong; but if it means the relation of John Wesley to himself, it is profoundly right.

The change which took place in Mr. Wesley's religious views, consisted in his decided and thorough reception of the doctrine; that a direct assurance of present salvation was connected with the exercise of true faith in Christ, such faith being alone the condition of God's favour, and the assurance it produced being followed by divine influences under which a life of perfect holiness might be secured. It was his aim, at this time and ever afterwards, to lay down this scheme with the utmost precision; but it is difficult to fix the exact meaning he attached to its most prominent terms. Whether faith itself was to be distinguished from the assurance with which it was connected? How far that assurance was independent of moral self-examination? In what sense holiness of life could comprehend the perfection of a Christian character? These are questions which he never seemed able satisfactorily to resolve. In fact, the logical method of exposition he adopted was unsuited to the nature of the subject he had to unfold. It was his fault, all his life long, that he failed to see the matters with which he dealt, in the depth and breadth that really belonged to them, and tried vainly to limit their nature in obedience to rules of formal reasoning. In the instance before us, we may accept the reality and importance of the change he underwent, without subscribing to his dogmatic statements respecting it. By putting aside those statements, and looking at the case as it had to do with the principles of religious philosophy, its significance increases in our apprehension, and we attach greater value to the movement it introduced. What does all this, about the truth of divine assurance and the power of divine influence express, but the one great doctrine, that religion consists in the union of God with the human soul, and is cultivated and perfected by every operation on His part which can render that union a vital and constant element of our spiritual experience? What is the simplicity of faith here insisted upon, but that entire resig-

---

* Moore's Life of Wesley, Vol. I. p. 345.

nation of the mind and heart to Christian truth, which opens the whole being for the reception of whatever good God has to bestow, and sanctifies the whole action to the performance of whatever service God may choose to command? No merit of works is taken into the account in such a process; all that is done is the establishment of the man in the right position. The work to be effected is the work of God, wrought out in contact with the fidelity of human endeavour; and it is by the exercise of this moral faith that what would otherwise be a mere question of theory is brought home to the personal feeling and practice of each subject of divine grace.

Great indeed was the difference between this representation of experimental Christianity and the view which Mr. Wesley formerly entertained. The former view presented a system of human means—efforts of mortification and benevolence and piety—as the materials of the Christian life. Now, the system followed was divine. God, ever present and ever active on His servants' behalf, was the object of unceasing trust; and to dwell in the light of His countenance, and to be conformed to His holy will, were the chief purposes of existence. We can mark this great difference in the effects of the new system as they are described to us. How great must have been the conviction of that difference, as the divine idea was made to supersede the human one in its influence upon character and conduct with regard to Wesley himself! Certainly he felt himself to be a new man. Nor can we wonder that when he began to preach this fresh gospel, he should have excited the attention and produced the effects he did. It was as enlightening and invigorating to others as it was to himself, and from what he saw, as well as from what he felt, he had a right to consider its publication as a revival of religion in the land. The opposition produced by his preaching was, moreover, as natural to the circumstances as the gladness with which it was hailed; for nothing so irritates men who are not prepared, in the spirit of penitent self-abandonment, to humble themselves before God, as the demand that everything of the nature of trust in their own righteousness should be superseded by the simple exercise of faith.

It is commonly stated, that when Mr. Wesley began to preach the doctrines, to the conviction of whose truth and

value he had thus attained, the pulpits of the Established Church were closed against him; partly on account of a disapproval of his views, and partly on account of the inconveniences resulting from his popularity. In forming an opinion on this question, it is but right that we should ask, What claim he had to the occupation of those pulpits? He had no claim at all. He and his friends seem to have thought that, because he felt a burning desire to communicate his newly-acquired knowledge to mankind, the clergy, in London and elsewhere, should have invited him to supersede themselves in the fulfilment of the work on which his heart was fixed. Thus, at a subsequent period, he affirmed of those clergymen who believed he proclaimed the gospel, "If they do not ask me to preach in their churches, they are accountable for my preaching in the fields."* But, though he regarded himself as specially called to the labour of an universal evangelist, it was unreasonable to suppose that that call would be unhesitatingly accepted by his brethren. As far as they thought differently from him, they could not be blamed for declining his assistance; and the circumstance of crowds of people flocking to their churches to hear a stranger, would not seem to them a justification for placing that stranger at their head. It may be true that some of them were influenced by a positive opposition to the religious interest which it was their duty to promote; but we are not to take it for granted that this was the case, when there was so much of a better character which can be reasonably advanced on their side. We are perhaps accustomed to transfer to this period of his life, the reverential feelings with which we regard the apostolic course that Mr. Wesley afterwards pursued. But those who only knew him at this period were under no obligation to acknowledge his apostleship. A young man who had at college the reputation of being a little crackbrained, and who had just returned from a colony which he had thrown into disorder by his vagaries, was not unnaturally considered as dangerous when he commenced a religious reformation. The parson-mind, I am aware, is often irritated by professional jealousy; but the ministers of any community could hardly be expected to hail the advent in their firmament of such a star as this. The fact was

---

* Southey's Life of Wesley, Vol. I. p. 249.

that, at the very beginning of his Methodist career, John Wesley assumed the prominent and ruling position which he continued always to maintain. I notice this fact as harmonizing with the character I have assigned to him during his Oxford life. Coleridge has said some hard things relating to this part of his character. He speaks of "Boy Wesley, Youth Wesley, Young Man, Man, Elder, Patriarch Wesley," as equally identified with "the first pronoun personal in all its cases, but only in the singular number;"* and repeats the sentiment in even worse forms. But this is not fair to the case, unless it be taken with an explanation which forbids to it all selfish bearing. What Boy Wesley and Youth Wesley were, does not need any other interpretation than that supplied by disposition and faculty; but Young Man, Man, Elder, and Patriarch Wesley, acted under the profound conviction that he was immediately directed from on high. In the station he occupied, God had placed him, and in the course he followed, God was leading him. Of that he felt assured. We may think him right or wrong in this, but we are bound to give him the benefit of it in our judgment of the relation in which he stood toward others. His fault lay, as we may have occasion more fully to point out, in his not giving to his coadjutors those opportunities of comparison with himself, by means of which their claims might be fairly adjusted in connection with his. But it was no vulgar ambition which caused him to act as he did. He believed that in so doing he was not seeking his own honour, but "glorifying his Father which is in heaven." No doubt, at the very best, he built upon the foundation of his natural qualifications; but this he would consider the line of his duty, provided what came to him by nature was sanctified under supernatural influences. In this sanctification he trusted, and for it he prayed and strove; and he thus reconciled himself to whatever authority came into his hands. He did not scheme for it nor grasp at it, though he appropriated it and employed it as properly belonging to him. In this he only answered to the best type of the delegated kings of men. Such authority as I am speaking of is reconcilable with the deepest personal humility.

---

* Southey's Life of Wesley, Vol. I. p. 132.

It was under the impulse of this feeling of being excluded from the churches of the land, that Mr. Wesley consented to adopt field preaching; to conduct religious services in unauthorized places of worship; and to employ lay agents as assistants to his ministry. These were innovations, the yielding to which marks a great alteration in his ecclesiastical position. The kind of Churchism of which he was the champion in Georgia was now discarded. He certainly did not intend to separate himself from the Church of England; but he had accepted the principle, that the order of that Church was to be put aside wherever the spiritual interests to which it was justly subservient could be best promoted by its neglect. It was impossible for him to escape from the imputation of this violation of order; and when put upon his defence he did not make out a clear case of justification. As a Christian minister, responsible only to God, he could not have been blamed; but as a clergyman, responsible to his episcopal superiors, he assumed far more liberty than he was entitled to. In reading the accounts of the interviews which he and his brother Charles had with Bishop Gibson and Archbishop Potter, our sympathies are on the side of the Church dignitaries, as conducting themselves with much forbearance under very painful circumstances. But nothing was suffered to stay the brothers in the course which they judged Providence had opened before them.

London and Bristol were the two places in which the first great success of Mr. Wesley's efforts was obtained, and where the organized form of the Methodist societies was originally adopted. But before this organization was effected, certain events took place which cleared the way for the establishment of these societies under the entire management of the one master-mind that was destined to preside over them.

No sooner was Mr. Wesley converted to those views of the assurance of faith which formed the foundation of his doctrine of salvation, than he sought broadly to distinguish his theology from that of William Law, whom he had formerly regarded as his leader. He wrote to Law for this purpose; and the spirit of his letter is, I am sorry to say, that of indignant reproof. He accused his old friend of having deceived and injured him in rela-

tion to his religious interests; and even reflected severely upon the temper and manners of the pietist. Law acquitted himself well in the correspondence which ensued. That correspondence develops much more impropriety on Wesley's part than his merely treating a theological difference as a personal offence. It strongly conveys the idea that he was vexed with himself at having been made the victim of a mistake, and considered his own honour in connection with the conclusions he adopted as the matter of first import. He had been wrong—he was now right: and he was resolved to maintain the right as a possession which set him above those who had participated with him in the wrong. He felt that he was wiser than his teachers; and rudely shook off the bonds of a past obedience. A disposition similar to this is manifested in a correspondence with his brother Samuel, which took place at the first stage of his new career. Samuel treated him as one in whom enthusiasm had overborne sobriety of judgment and conduct; but he reasoned closely with him and on terms of brotherly equality. John, on the other hand, though much the younger of the two, wrote in a prophetic rather than a brotherly tone, and pressed his opinions in a moral rather than an argumentative form. It was what he had himself felt and seen that he chiefly insisted upon; and it was to the spiritual condition of his correspondent that he made his strongest appeal—"O brother, would to God you would leave disputing concerning things which you know not, if indeed you know them not, and beg of God to fill up what is yet wanting in you. Why should not you also seek till you receive that peace of God which passeth all understanding?"* There was here the same spirit of self-assertion which directed his remonstrance with Law. In both cases he cut off the ground from around him, and stood alone, fully supported by the confident persuasion of the truth of his own opinions.

Another step, in the direction of forming religious associations over which he might have complete control, was taken by Mr. Wesley when he separated himself from the Moravians. There was considerable justification for his disapproval of their proceedings. Much that passed between

---

* Wesley's Works, Vol. XII. p. 34.

him and them manifests on their part a strong tendency to put aside religious practice in favour of passive dependence upon God. As he states the case, their "way to faith" led them "not to use what we term the means of grace, not to go to church, not to communicate, not to fast, not to use so much private prayer, not to read the Scripture,... not to do temporal good, nor to attempt doing spiritual good."* This form of religion was always specially abhorrent to him. A strong moral tone pervaded all his teachings, sometimes even at the risk of inconsistency. Whatever inclined toward Antinomianism he instinctively resisted. This is to be taken into our account in judging of his conduct in the instance before us. And we have also to take into account the extreme silliness attaching to the manner in which the Moravians frequently expressed their religious ideas. Enthusiasm with many of them took the shape of utter nonsense; and it was the constant strife of John Wesley to gain for his own enthusiasm the credit of the plainest sense. Accuracy of statement, and aptness of phrase, he sought for with a conscientious directness of purpose. But when we have allowed for all this, the case is not fully cleared up. It does not appear that Moravianism, regarded as a whole, was other when Mr. Wesley separated from it, than it was when he connected himself with it; and it is very evident that the modes of thought adopted by the Moravians were, generally speaking, truer to the religious theory common to them and him, than Mr. Wesley's were. These people (whom on this account he called mystics) considered the essence of religion to consist in keeping the soul in such a frame of divine contemplation as would secure a constant spiritual communion with God. For this they waited, with devout submission. Outward ordinances and exercises they held to be entirely subordinate to this; and guarded themselves against every influence which might divert their attention from the great inward work to which their efforts were mainly directed. Mr. Wesley was not fitted to appreciate this conception of the subject. His was a mind wanting in depth of reflection. He saw nothing as a reality but what he could state in the way of sharp verbal definition. He thus put the disparagement of outward

* Moore's Life of Wesley, Vol. I. p. 478.

services, and the cultivation of inward piety in contrast with each other. He no doubt was furnished with many instances of such a contrast; but, if he could have looked beneath the surface of the matter, he might have found a root of union where he perceived only opposition. His own faith required to be traced to this root, though he never dreamt of digging for it. It was his constant error that, holding views which could only truly rest upon a free and full acknowledgment of the principle of divine influence as independent of mere doctrinal belief, he based them upon the correctness with which such belief was held. It thus became one of his great objects to maintain the integrity of his doctrine as an absolute necessity of his theory. This lack of sympathy with Moravianism is due, in the largest measure, to Wesley's distinctive individuality; but it is also due, in some degree, to his national sensibilities. Coleridge has acutely said of the separation we are now concerned with: "The true *ground* is to be sought for in the diversity of the German and English genius."* "The parties could not but misunderstand each other, for Zinzendorf was a Theosopher or Cabiric metaphysician without logic, and Wesley a logician without metaphysics."† The first of these quotations from Coleridge is preceded by the following statement: "Wesley's insulated and monocratic spirit, in other words, his incapability of existing other than as the positive pole, was doubtless the main immediate cause of the breach at this time."‡ This is also true. It was impossible for him to be connected with a religious movement, on the Moravian conditions. He may be imagined as always, consciously or unconsciously, asking himself the question, How can I continue the work to which I am appointed, if I am obliged to act under the control of others? Count Zinzendorf and he could not together have occupied the station into which the characters of both naturally forced them. Nor could Wesley have been content with the place he would have been obliged to take in an already organized community like the Moravian one. What led him to break through the order of the Church of England, would have led him to break through

---

* Southey's Life of Wesley, Vol. I. p. 219. † Ibid. p. 220.

‡ Ibid. p. 219.

the order of any other church not formed and managed by himself. There is, therefore, considerable likelihood in what James Hutton, the Moravian, says on this subject, though it is to be taken with such limitations as the preceding remarks may suggest:

"John Wesley, displeased at not being thought so much of as formerly, and offended with the easy way of salvation as taught by the Brethren, publicly spoke against our doctrines in his sermons, and his friends did the same. In June, 1740, he formed his Foundery Society in opposition to the one which met at Fetter Lane, and which had become a Moravian Society. Many of our usual hearers consequently left us, especially the females. We asked his forgiveness if in anything we had aggrieved him; but he continued full of wrath, accusing the Brethren that they, by dwelling exclusively on the doctrine of faith, neglected the law and zeal for sanctification. In short, he became our declared opponent; and the two societies of the Brethren and Methodists thenceforward were separated, and became independent of each other."*

Whatever the causes of this separation might have been, the result was, that it removed one of the main barriers in the way of that course of unfettered personal action on which Mr. Wesley was about to enter.

There remained another obstacle to the full liberty of self-determination to which Mr. Wesley attained as the leader of the people who submitted to his teaching. This obstacle was the theological difference between him and Mr. Whitfield. They had hitherto acted in concert. But Wesley was an Arminian, and Whitfield was a Calvinist. Each one had, in these respects, his followers, among the common body of converts, and it could scarcely be avoided that the two parties which were thus formed should come into collision. Mr. Wesley brought the contention to a head by preaching and publishing a sermon, entitled "Free Grace," against the doctrine of predestination. It is among his ablest productions, and Whitfield had but little chance against the argumentative force it displayed. Whitfield's mind was constituted very differently from Wesley's. The theology he had adopted was embraced by him with an entire faith which was incapable of change. He gave up his whole soul to its influence without any drawback of

* Tyerman's Life of J. Wesley, Vol. I. p. 300.

doubt. As to defending it when attacked—that was with him a strange work. The work appropriate to him lay in powerfully applying it to others as indisputably true. He was, however, a man of a large and tender heart, and his regard for Wesley was reverential in the extreme. It is painful to witness the struggles he underwent throughout the controversy that ensued. His passionate appeals that all strife might be put an end to, and his equally passionate assertions of the reality of his own convictions, win our strongest sympathy in his favour. We see how impossible it was for him to escape from the unfortunate circumstances in which he was involved; and we at the same time feel how pure and generous were the intentions with which he acted, in spite of his insuperable intellectual difficulties. It was all in vain. The master had issued the decree, and the pupil must submit or depart. It is very doubtful whether, if this theological controversy had not occurred, Whitfield could have connected himself with the organization of the Methodist societies. He had no talent for conducting such organization; and, in all probability, he would have shewn no interest in co-operating with it. He acted invariably in the spirit of St. Paul's declaration: "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." I have spoken of the ability with which Mr. Wesley conducted his part of this controversy; but, though agreeing with him in his anti-Calvinistic conclusions, I cannot but think that it was a shallow ability that in this instance distinguished him. I give him all honour for that persuasion, already noticed, which led him to oppose every encouragement of immorality. He thought the Predestinarian theory had this tendency, and he therefore withstood it. But he did not perceive that the theory of salvation by faith, as held by himself, was also inconsistent with the integrity of the principles of man's moral action; nor did he calculate upon the weight of motive toward purity and rectitude which might be connected with a belief in the exclusive privileges of the elect. I yield to the full force of all he says as to the fearful representation of the Divine Being which the Predestination theory, when carried out to its just conclusions, conveys. But the limitation of mercy in relation to the final destiny of the larger part of mankind belongs to the Arminian as well as to the Calvinistic scheme; and it

is a narrow view of God's universal love which abstains from extending the full benefit of that love to all his intelligent creatures. What we have, however, especially to observe now, is the effect of this controversy in breaking the last link which bound John Wesley to any other directing influence besides his own sense of truth and right as before God. When he separated himself from Whitfield, and shook off his Calvinistic associations, he had altogether within his own power the modification and guidance of the religious movement which has ever since passed under his name.

We have thus brought ourselves to the commencement of the systematic form of Methodism. It consisted, at first, merely of a machinery for keeping together those people who adhered to the ministry of John and Charles Wesley. To John alone the origination of this machinery is to be attributed. It is not, however, to be supposed that it was the result of a plan which he had previously conceived. It did not arise in that way at all; but gradually grew up from an endeavour to meet the necessities of the time as they occurred. The skill it manifested was not that of an elaborate foresight, but that of a wise adaptation of existing resources, employed under the influence of an ever-watchful experience. The institution of which I am speaking, joined the members of the Methodist societies together in distinct bodies called Classes, which met once a week under appointed Leaders, who also, with other officers called Stewards, had regular meetings among themselves. This arrangement was designed primarily for purposes of pecuniary contribution, but it immediately became the characteristic means of mutual edification. It was placed absolutely under the direction of Mr. Wesley. When I say that it was primarily designed for the purposes of pecuniary contribution, I mean that the necessity of such contribution first gave rise to the special scheme I have described. The societies existed before, but they assumed this structure under that necessity. This took place in 1742; and in 1743 the society rules, which are still in force, were drawn up and universally applied. No one who reflects upon the nature of this machinery can fail to perceive how admirably it was adapted both to the secular and the spiritual purposes to which it was directed, and how wisely it united all the

members of the societies in the work to be done, giving to every one, according to his ability, the interest of active employment in the common cause.

The general idea of such societies as were thus consolidated was not, even in 1740, when they were first collected, by any means a new one. John Wesley himself classes the friends who gathered round him at Oxford, and an association which he established in Georgia, among the Methodist societies; and the society at Fetter Lane, which, when he parted from the Moravians, he left in their hands, fairly belongs to the same classification. We cannot, indeed, disconnect the Methodist societies, in principle, from those of the United Brethren. The two institutions do not merely agree in both being communities for religious purposes; but the close supervision which, in the Moravian body, was exercised over the members, entered into the spirit of the Methodist body from the beginning. Mr. Wesley learned his method of discipline, as well as the peculiarities of his theology, from Moravianism. What he did, was to give to this discipline the precise modification which answered to his own views and wants. But there was another influence under which he acted, quite as powerful as that supplied by the Moravian Church. I have already mentioned the existence at this period of what were called "The Religious Societies," and the influence to which I refer is that which was exerted by them. These societies were to be found, not only in London, but in Bristol and various other towns. They had been in operation for more than sixty years. Their object was to promote the practice of religion among their members by a more intimate intercourse than was provided for in the order of the Church of England. These members, however, belonged to that Church, and were pledged to a regular use of its services. John Wesley must have been well acquainted with their character, all his life long. His father was not only connected with them, but had written in their favour. We cannot doubt that both the Oxford and the Georgian Methodism owed their conception to this well-known movement; and, as a matter of fact, it was among these "Religious Societies," in London and Bristol, that the Wesleys exercised their ministry when they could not occupy the churches. The Methodist bodies which were afterwards formed assumed a singular

resemblance to these existing bodies; only differing from them, indeed, when a wider scope demanded the difference. Methodism, as in the other instance, without separating from the Church, adopted an administration of its own, which was specially directed to the cultivation of the spiritual life in its personal relations; but, unlike the other instance, it extended its membership beyond that of the Church of England, inviting into its pale all who sympathized with its designs and would comply with its regulations. It is a significant fact, that after the spread of Methodism through the land, we hear nothing of the former "Religious Societies." The new movement appears to have completely absorbed the old one.

Thus the Methodist institution came into operation—a strong and skilful hand availing itself of whatever would suit its purpose of construction; and an unfaltering decision, not proud or vain, but devoutly confident, removing every obstruction that lay in the way of its efforts. The course of procedure that was followed, is to be admired on many accounts, but on none more than as it was the natural development of the character of its one great agent. The individual manifestation is the most interesting of all. The history is an autobiography. As such, indeed, it was invariably treated by John Wesley himself. He always wrote as if he felt himself to be the real hero of his tale. His faith and habits, his judgment and aims, were from the beginning the things first in question. We shall understand nothing truly about Methodism unless we measure it by this personal standard. As to the philosophical aspect of the societies built up in the way I have described, they presented a singular union of strict order and spontaneous enthusiasm—in this again answering to Mr. Wesley's character. Unregulated religious fervour we often meet with elsewhere, as we not less often meet with unimpassioned religious obedience. Here the fervour in its intensest warmth, and the obedience in its most submissive surrender, were joined together in undistinguishable harmony. Religion has, in other times and circumstances, effected such a harmony; but this result has never been more strongly marked than in the case of Methodism.

The special ministry which formed the one work of Mr. Wesley during the remainder of his life, now opened before

him. From the time when his societies were thus systematized, he spent all his energies in strengthening and improving and increasing them. There was, henceforth, no break in the uniform tenor of his way. The day of preparation was over; and the day of settled business had begun. The past was a series of wanderings; the future stretched forward in a clear and open road. For the present, I stop at this turning-point of the journey. In another paper I will review the mission with which Mr. Wesley's name is distinctively associated.

Meanwhile let us try to gather an accurate conception of how this remarkable man appeared, at this period of his history, to those who were interested in his doings. From among the many materials which may assist in forming such a conception, there is one piece of information which has often struck me as being peculiarly impressive in the picture it presents. At a very early part of his evangelical course, Mr. Wesley visited Epworth, his native town. He asked for permission to preach in the church where his father had ministered for so many years, but received a refusal from the incumbent. He thereupon took his station in the churchyard, and preached day after day to a great concourse of people, standing upon his father's tombstone. How profound are the emotions excited by the contemplation of that scene! It shines upon us with a wondrous light, as we connect it with what had been and what was yet to be. The living voice of prophecy blends in our ears with the pathetic tones of the dead. In the crowd on one of those occasions was a young man of the name of Whitelamb. He was the rector of Wroote, a living which had been held by Samuel Wesley the elder in connection with Epworth. He had married a daughter of his predecessor; but he was now a widower, and seems to have been alienated from the family. He was a man of good character, but of free religious opinions. His brother-in-law describes him as an unbeliever. After listening to this open-air preaching, he addressed a letter to his old friend and near relation, from which the following sentences are taken.

"I saw you at Epworth on Tuesday evening. Fain would I have spoken to you, but that I am quite at a loss how to address or behave. Your way of thinking is so extraordinary, that your presence creates an awe, as if you were an inhabitant of another

world.....Indeed I cannot think as you do, any more than I can help honouring and loving you. Dear sir, will you credit me? I retain the highest veneration and affection for you. The sight of you moves me strangely. My heart overflows with gratitude. I feel, in a high degree, all that tenderness and yearning of bowels with which I am affected toward every branch of Mr. Wesley's family. I cannot refrain from tears when I reflect, This is the man who at Oxford was more than a father to me: This is he whom I have there heard expound or dispute publicly, or preach at St. Mary's with such applause: and oh! that I should ever add, whom I have lately heard preach at Epworth. .....God open all our eyes and lead us into truth, whatever it be."*

There is an earnest truthfulness in this representation which is very affecting; and accepting it, as we must do, with undoubting reliance, we appear to realize the influence which Mr. Wesley's ministrations had upon that class of persons who, with all respect for his sincerity and zeal, could not assent to his doctrines. To look at him with their eyes, is to gain a true, though partial, idea of him. In this wise, we may safely say, he then stood toward a large and intelligent class of his contemporaries.

JOHN GORDON.

V.—THE VOYSEY JUDGMENT.

PROBABLY not one of Mr. Voysey's sympathizers looked for his acquittal on his recent prosecution, or imagined that his later productions could possibly be sanctioned by Ecclesiastical Law. Yet it cannot be denied that since the failure of his Appeal, the Judgment which condemned him has been but coldly received by many even of his opponents. The Ritualists fear that their turn is at hand, and look jealously on legal control over theology; and the Broad Church fear that his effort to stretch their chains has served only to tighten them. Nor do we think them wrong. The comprehensive policy of the *Gorham* and the

---

* Hampson's Life of Wesley, Vol. II. p. 86.

Essays cases has been not only abandoned, but reversed; and the limits of clerical belief have, for the first time, been perceptibly narrowed by judicial legislation. It is the object of the present article to shew in what places this has been done. If it be objected that this view implies that the Privy Council have decided questions which the Articles left undecided, and have, therefore, in so far misconstrued those Articles, we do not shrink from such a conclusion. Indeed, that result was to be expected from the very nature of Mr. Voysey's defence. Whilst some of the incriminated passages of his writings might fairly hope for acquittal, there were others which no interpretation could reconcile with the Church's formularies. She might tolerate Universalism, but she indisputably held an Atonement: if she were Pelagian, she was certainly not Socinian. Now an acquittal on the former class of charges would have been worthless to Mr. Voysey, if the latter had been held to be proved; and he, therefore, was wisely led to insist on a line of defence which, if successful, could rescue him scot free. He boldly maintained the inconsistency of the Articles, claimed a liberty of contradicting all inferences from them so long as their *ipsissima verba* were not denied, and argued for a wide principle of interpretation which should sanction any position that could claim to be deduced by any process of reasoning from any propositions in their contents. By adopting this extended line of defence he abridged his opportunities of examining in sufficient detail the particular charges made against him, and he distracted the attention of the Court from those details which he dwelt upon. He no doubt acted prudently; for if his general defence failed, condemnation on some points was inevitable; and it mattered nothing whether he were condemned on one or two charges the more. But the absence of this minute discussion led the Court to pronounce censures which seriously affect the liberties of clerical thought, and which its presence might have averted.

We proceed now to an analysis of these passages.

Charges i.—xiv. These concern Mr. Voysey's heresies on the Atonement. This part of the Judgment declares that a clergyman may not "without qualification deny that Christ bore the punishment due to our sins, or suffered in our stead." This is certainly a new limitation; for though

Articles II., XV., XXXI., cited in the Judgment, require a belief that Christ's suffering, Christ's death, and Christ's burial, reconciled God to man, and were a sacrifice, an offering, a redemption, a propitiation, and a sacrifice for sin, both original and actual, they do not in any way define the mode in which this was effected. "How and in what manner it had this efficacy," says Bishop Butler, "there are not wanting persons who have endeavoured to explain; but I do not find that the Scripture has explained it." That it was by a "substitution," is, indeed, a popular Evangelical theory, but it has never been a universal one, and was nowhere taught by the Church; yet this Judgment makes it an authoritative dogma. The effect of this on the position of that moderate Broad-Church school who follow Mr. Maurice more or less closely, and explain the Atonement in various non-Evangelical modes, must indeed be serious.

Charges xiv.—xix. Mr. Voysey's doctrine of human nature is the subject of these. The result of Articles II., IX., XXXI., is to assert the belief in an original guilt or depravation (called in them indifferently *culpa originis, peccatum originis, peccatum originale, peccata originalia*), which required Christ's sacrifice, propitiation and satisfaction, which inclines every human being, even the baptized, to evil, and which in every person, except the baptized, deserveth damnation.* After this, Mr. Voysey could hardly be at liberty to teach that there is *no* original sin, and nothing which required sacrifice; or to deny that every man is born "in sin," and therefore under what must surely be, or imply, a curse. Had the Articles been silent, a reference to the Catechism would have reminded him that among the primary doctrines of the Church stands the position, that "we are by nature the children of wrath, and by Baptism are made the children of grace." A question, however, arises upon Mr. Voysey's teaching as to the effects of original sin, though the sin itself be beyond

* The translation says that hereby "man is *very far* gone from original righteousness;" but the Latin original is much stronger, "*quam longissime.*" A curious discrepancy in Article IX. should be pointed out in condensing its purport. In the Latin original, the word *renatis* occurs twice, and is rendered in the English, once by "regenerate," and afterwards by "baptized." Probably each person who subscribes the Articles takes in both places the meaning he prefers. I adopt the latter meaning, as most consistent.

discussion. It is conceded by the Judgment, and the concession may hereafter produce fruit, that to be born in sin does not necessarily involve being subjected to *endless* suffering; and thus an ultimate hope remains even for unbaptized infants. But Mr. Voysey, in attacking original sin, went on to deny that it had caused any estrangement of man from God. Much of what he says, and of what he was prosecuted for saying, is admitted by the Judgment to be innocent. But on one passage the Privy Council set a mark. Mr. Voysey had said, "We are not separated from God, nor under his wrath; God is always with us all, and we are His children by nature, and therefore we are near and dear to Him all our lives through.... We are not alone, because our Father is with us; and you can offer no friend, no Saviour, no comforter, so good and true and faithful as He." These words they twice cite, and pronounce them to be an advised contravention of the Church's doctrine. This, again, limits the boundaries of clerical liberty. Not only must you believe in original sin, not only that it operates in every person, and that in him *it* deserves God's wrath—this the Articles have told us—but you must add that *he* deserves and (at any rate if unbaptized) receives God's wrath on account of it. The IXth Article emphatically denies the latter of these propositions, so far as relates to the baptized, and it certainly does not assert it of the unbaptized. In other words, it admits that original sin may struggle in the heart of some who are nevertheless, on the whole, accepted before God; and it never denies that such a state is possible for all. The Privy Council has now distinctly denied it.

It is worth while to pause a moment to consider the terms of the passage condemned. The clergy of the Church of England are now bound to believe that the results of original sin on the feelings of the Deity are such that He will never regard unbaptized persons as being naturally His children, nor hold them near and dear to Him; He is not their Father, and they have other friends, saviours and comforters, more good, more faithful and more true than He. The pure soul of Elizabeth Fry was no child of the Highest; and the Theists of India slander the Universal Spirit when they call him Parent.

But we come now to a part of the Judgment which, but

that it seems founded on so plain a misapprehension, we should regard as fraught with the most fatal consequences. Mr. Voysey, in stating his grounds for rejecting the Atonement, had said that Christ "never hinted at such a doctrine as that of the Fall of Man, or the Atonement by Sacrifice, or Justification by Faith. He never taught that men needed to be accounted righteous before God, or needed any Mediator to propitiate His wrath, or to draw them to Himself. All these notions were Jewish, and Christ never gave any sanction or encouragement to them that I have been able to discover."

This passage is twice cited in the Judgment, and is declared in one place to be "a clear contradiction of Articles II. and XI.;" and in the other, the Council think "it cannot be reconciled with the teaching of the II., XV. and XXXI. Articles of Religion." Yet we cannot fail to note that the offending passage does not in one syllable dispute the doctrines of those Articles, but simply says that Jesus never taught them. It is useless to remark that divine after divine has said precisely the same thing with regard to many other doctrines which he firmly believed. It is a stock argument of Catholics and High-churchmen, that neither Christ nor any of the writers of the New Testament ever explicitly taught many of the doctrines which nevertheless are not only true, but are indispensable to salvation. It is the belief of a large school of eminent Trinitarian scholars that the doctrine of Christ's Deity was never taught by him on earth, and was unknown even to the apostles till after his ascension. We would add much more on this topic, but it cannot be that the Privy Council in future Judgments will adhere to the rule it here implicitly adopted, and will punish a man as denying a doctrine because he denies that one particular portion of Scripture contains it.

We pass to the charges xx.—xxviii., which relate to Mr. Voysey's heresies with regard to the Trinity and the person and advent of Christ. The Council say, as cannot be denied, that to maintain that Christ is no more "Very God of Very God, begotten not made," than men in general are, is repugnant to the Articles. Mr. Voysey has said that the statement that Christ was such Very God of Very God is "as true of all of us as of Him." This might have been explained away by alleging that "as true" meant only "similarly true,"

and not "identically true in degree;" but Mr. Voysey did not offer any such explanation in his Defence, and on any other interpretation he was clearly denying the Deity of Christ in any sense in which the word Deity has a distinctive meaning. On this point the Judgment seems to contain no new rule, as it condemned Mr. Voysey's words only in that sense of them which he did not deny having used. Had he pleaded for the interpretation of them which we have suggested, and had yet been condemned, a new limit might have been imposed on mysticising speculations on the divine origin of the soul; but this, as matters stand, has not been done.

The remaining articles of charge, xxix.—xxxviii., relate to Mr. Voysey's errors concerning the Scriptures; and the part of the Judgment which bears on these is certainly the most prejudicial to clerical liberties. Before discussing it, it is well to recall the concessions that were made in the *Essays and Reviews* case. The Dean of Arches held that it is "open to the clergy to maintain that any Book in the Bible is the work of another author than him whose name it bears, provided that they conform to the Sixth Article by admitting that the Book is an inspired writing and canonical." And again: "The true construction of the Sixth, Seventh and Twentieth Articles is, that the Scriptures, so far as relates to matters concerning salvation, were written by the Divine interposition of God, and that in a manner different from the ordinary agency of Providence; *but I cannot go the length of saying that all parts of what are termed the Holy Scriptures were without exception so written.*" And the Privy Council, on appeal, permitted Mr. Wilson's theory of the mixture of "divine and human elements" in the Bible, and of the Word of God being contained in Scripture but not co-extensive with it, and said: "The proposition or assertion that every part of the Scripture was written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, is not to be found in the Articles or in any of the Formularies of the Church. .....The framers of the Articles have not used the word 'inspiration' as applied to the Holy Scripture; nor have they laid down anything as to the nature, extent or limits of that operation of the Holy Spirit."

The result evidently was, that there is in the Bible an undefined amount of matter whose inspiration, and conse-

quently whose credibility, morality or wisdom, may be denied. If a clergyman denied the inspiration of any particular passage (not being an entire book), he was *primâ facie* innocent, and could be proved guilty only by its being (if possible) shewn that the Church had in some manner pledged herself to the inspiration of that passage.

The new Judgment does not of course contradict the former one; but it materially limits its practical application, by withdrawing from its protection the very cases which most needed it. The grounds of disbelief are as innumerable as the grounds of belief; but assuredly, of all the reasons that can be given for rejecting a statement, none can be more conclusive than that it contradicts Divine Wisdom; and of all doubtful passages of the Bible, none would be more generally rejected than those in which the Bible seems at variance with itself. Yet this is precisely the one class of cases in which the recent Judgment declares that the clergyman shall *not* doubt or deny.

This result is attained by an ingenious application of Article XX. This Article is a definition of the authority of the Church, and was intended mainly as a denial of the Roman claims. It runs, "The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith; and yet it is not lawful *(non licet)* for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written, *neither may* (potest) *it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another.*" These words are plainly intended to define the limitations of that authority which the former part of the sentence ascribes to the Church, and to shew in what cases a pretended exercise of this authority would be beyond her powers and unbinding on the conscience of her children. This is even more apparent in the original Latin, contrasting the *non licet* and the *non potest*, the natural and the positive limits of the Church's power, as if to say "she is prohibited from contravening the general tenor of Scripture, and is not even entrusted with power to decide upon conflicting passages and pronounce what that general tenor may be." Like a judge, she must not so interpret the law she expounds, as to make it seem self-contradictory; but this in no way abridges the right of each of her members, like a private jurist, to admit and discuss the inconsistencies of that law.

Moreover, in the remaining portion of the Article, this clause is referred to or recapitulated by the words, "*as it ought not to decree anything against the same*, so beside the same ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation." This undoubtedly declares that the Church may not with her authoritative voice assert anything which is contrary to the Bible; but that individual clergymen, who do not speak with authoritative voice, but only in the expression of personal opinion, may assert such things, is admitted by all the Judgments on the *Essays and Reviews*, and even by the very Judgment before us. It is impossible to shew more completely that the positions of Article XX. concern only ecclesiastical authority and not private discussion, their result being, in fact, to abridge the powers of the Church, and thereby directly to extend, and not to limit, the province of free inquiry.

The Privy Council do not, however, thus minutely weigh the Article, but say, rather epigrammatically, "We think that no private clergyman can do that which the whole Church is, by the Twentieth Article, declared to be incompetent to do, viz., expound one part of Scripture in a manner repugnant to another"—a logic which were faultless if the private clergyman offered his exposition as "an Authority in controversies of faith." The report of this passage is not, indeed, free from confusion; for the *preceding* sentence forbids a clergyman to reject a passage as contradictory, only when he "founds himself, not upon any critical inquiry, but simply upon his own taste and judgment." But, plainly, if Article XX. applies to private expositions, no amount of critical inquiry could excuse a divine for contravening its prohibitions. And, again, what is critical inquiry, except the exercise of the critic's taste and judgment? Clearly the rule can be acted on only in the stringent terms of the second sentence; and on this principle Mr. Voysey was clearly condemnable, for he admitted having taught the existence of contradictory passages. That many such do exist, reconcilable perhaps by ingenious hypotheses, but contradictory in the ordinary meaning of the words and the ordinary construction of rhetoric, all commentators admit. But in these cases the general liberty of rejecting Scripture is withdrawn by the Judgment, and the Church thus leads us to this singular canon of criticism—that she

never feels assured that the Bible is infallible, except when it seems to contradict itself.

A passage follows in the Judgment which at first sight seems a serious limitation of clerical liberty, but on inspection appears resolvable into the misuse of a word. The Council says, "We find whole passages declared to be spurious on no other grounds than that they do not approve themselves to the appellant's taste." Now it has never been doubted that the clergy enjoyed complete freedom of criticising the text of Scripture, and of rejecting from any of its books any passage which they thought an interpolation. And Dr. Lushington, in the *Essays and Reviews* case, though he held it illegal to deny inspiration, yet fully conceded that "learned divines, of whose orthodoxy there is no reason to doubt, have come to the conclusion that certain verses or parts have been erroneously introduced, and are not really entitled to take their place in Scripture. I am of opinion that under such circumstances the law would not require me to hold persons coming to similar conclusions guilty of any ecclesiastical offence."

Mr. Voysey's method of negation has, however, been generally a bolder one than mere discussion of Greek MSS.; and the charges against him (on which alone the Council had to pronounce judgment) were for rejecting passages of Scripture, not as textually spurious, but as historically false. We may therefore believe that the Council did not in their Judgment employ the word "spurious" in its technical sense, or intend to limit the present uncontrolled liberty of criticising the Greek text. The smallest limitation on that liberty would be its utter destruction; for every critical rejection is necessarily a rejection of what "does not approve itself" to the rejector's critical taste, and no scales exist by which Justice can weigh conflicting tastes. If the Council did, in fact, intend that she should do so, clerical liberty is sorely confined. Selden condemned equity because "it varied with the measure of the judge's foot;" but a legal standard of Greek criticism would vary almost with the measure of the judge's pulse.

The Council gave Mr. Voysey a week to retract. By the blessing of Heaven on the labours of the Judicial Committee, he might be brought to regard geology and philology as fond things vainly invented and founded on no certain

warranty of holy writ. The Solicitor-General might be the happy instrument of leading him to abhor, detest and abjure the impious and heretical doctrine that God is just. He might pronounce not only "the sacrifices of masses," but also the discoveries of science, to be "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." Mr. Voysey did none of these. He had lost his battle, and he accepted his defeat, and accepted it gallantly. For years he has been fighting the battle of free thought in the Church, and we freethinkers have no right to complain because he fought it obstinately and to the last.

We have now completed our analysis of the Judgment, and find that it has resulted (1) in pledging the clergy to a particular explanation of the modus of the Atonement; (2) in pledging them to a more extreme view of the effects of the Fall; (3) in withdrawing their rights of scriptural criticism from the passages where they would be most likely to be exercised.

Against these no gain is to be set off; for no liberty is conceded that had not been established by former Judgments.

The Judgment, as a whole, will not take a rank equal to its forerunners. It has neither the erudition of the *Gorham* Judgment, nor the clearness and power of that delivered in the *Essays* case. Perhaps the deficiency is, in some measure, due to the death of Lord Kingsdown, whose part in those Judgments was well known, and contributed so largely to their comprehensive policy, that Oxford declined afterwards to give him a Doctor's degree.

A greater familiarity with the theology of the day might have led the Council to use less general terms in some of their declarations, and thus have prevented the narrowing policy which has occasioned our comments. It might also have restrained their statement, that "it would be as contrary to morality as to law to direct the professors of any religion daily to offer prayer to one in whose divine power they have no faith,"—a startling criticism on the ethics of that half of Europe that worships a Madonna. No one suspects the Privy Council of being tainted with Popish theology; but we thought that, at any rate, they had heard of Dulia and Hyperdulia.

Mr. Voysey has lost his living, but he is still a clergyman, and still punishable for teaching heresy. Still it is

nearly a quarter of a century since any clergyman has been so punished after he had honestly become a Dissenter; and practically the Church has set Mr. Voysey free. But she has fettered the parishioners of Healaugh, who must henceforth listen to no religious teachings except such as they disbelieve. Mr. Voysey has lost his pulpit, not because he was disliked by the people who did hear him, but because he was disliked by the people who did not. If Dissent is wrong in allowing a minister's hearers to deprive him, is the Church right in allowing external meddlers to do so? It is a little hard that you may neither dismiss your teacher when you do not like him, nor retain him when you do. In Dissent, the congregation sometimes coerce the minister: this is tyranny. In the Church of England, two private societies, the Church Union and the Church Association, coerce both minister and congregation: is this liberty?

COURTNEY KENNY.

To our contributor's lucid statement of the precise bearing of the Privy Council's Judgment in Mr. Voysey's case, we have nothing to add. Nor in regard to Mr. Voysey himself is it necessary to say much. Whatever in his public career, up to this time, we have felt impelled to approve has belonged to himself; whatever we could not choose but condemn, has been mainly due to the ecclesiastical system with which he was involved. In the present connection, we have nothing to do either with the exact nature of his dogmatic conclusions, or with the qualities of mind and heart which he has manifested in their exposition. It is enough to say, that he thought it his duty to put to the test the right of absolutely free speech within the Church of England; that what he had to say he said boldly, clearly and reverently; that in the course of a long and, in some respects, an oppressive legal process, he has not suffered himself to slide into impatience or petulance; and that, when at last decisively condemned, he met the invitation to retract his heresies with the dignified contempt which it deserved. For ourselves, we must openly and emphatically confess that we never thought his position tenable either legally or morally; that we rejoice in his condemnation; and that we should have looked upon his acquittal as a death-blow to accuracy of thought and honesty

of speech in the Church of England. Putting aside all theological special-pleading, if a man holding the opinions expressed in Mr. Voysey's sermons can lawfully sign the Articles (no matter in how modified a sense) and read the Liturgy of the Church of England, there is henceforth not only no stringency in tests, but no meaning in words which bear a religious sense. The whole administration of religion becomes a jungle of phrases, in which every variety of belief and no-belief may hide itself, but which is a hopeless labyrinth, a waterless wilderness, to the simple soul and the unwarped conscience. Are we to suppose that He who requireth truth in the inward parts can be acceptably approached by an utterance of the lips which means one thing to the utterer and quite another to all who hear it?

From all this Mr. Voysey is now free, and we offer him our hearty congratulations upon his freedom. If he has not gone forth into the wilderness, like the Israelites from Egypt, in voluntary search of a purer air and a freer life, but rather, like the scapegoat, has been thrust out into the desert, followed by the curses of his people, he might fairly tell us that what he has done and borne has been for the brethren's sake, and that he has desired to suffer the penalty of sins which were theirs as well as his. We can imagine him saying to the party in the Church which is supposed to sympathize with him, "As long as there was place for me, there was place for you; but now that in my person the principle of free speech in the Church is decisively condemned, we must all look the facts of the position in the face." Of course we do not wish to imply that Mr. Voysey does say anything of this kind; it is quite possible that he takes the opposite view, and advises his Broad-church friends to follow his own example, and to stay where they are as long as they can. Only one thing is quite certain, and that is, that the so-called liberal clergy mean to ignore the Judgment. They are already telling the world, in every variety of phrase, that it does not necessarily touch them because it condemns Mr. Voysey. They lament it, in general terms, as a restriction of liberty within the Church, and will probably in future say less than they have done about the gradually widening effect of Privy Council Judgments; but they do not seem to feel any heavier fetters on their own limbs, or to find the Palace of the

Church narrowed and dwarfed into the Prison of an Establishment. Nor—we say it not only in sober earnest, but in deep sorrow—do we wonder at this. When men have accustomed themselves to say their prayers in a non-natural sense, and in presence of God and the Church to use words with "accommodation," such distant and almost impalpable things as Articles and Judgments are not likely to press upon them with the weight of immediate personal obligation.

The fact is, that this Judgment strikes straight at the heart of the Broad-church party. For the one principle of religious inquiry which binds the whole of that party together (for its right and left wings differ widely in their theoretical relation to Scripture), is, that no course of action which the highest human conscience regards as in any degree unjust or cruel or immoral, can lawfully be ascribed to God. And on this account it is that the first and most general collision of this party with ordinary orthodox doctrine, has been upon the ground of a vicarious atonement and an eternal hell. To borrow the tongue of Exeter Hall, these are the points upon which the Broad Church is prevailingly "unsound." It would not be difficult to quote passages from the writings of its leading theologians, which to ordinary apprehension would seem to contradict in express terms the statement of the second Article, that Christ "truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, *to reconcile his Father to us*, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men;" nor would it be an answer to the contradiction, at least from the Church of England point of view, to allege that Mr. Maurice had on his side no less an authority than Paul, whose definition of "the ministry of reconciliation" is, that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." But now the Privy Council have gone a step further in definition than the Article. If words mean anything, the Church is shut up to the doctrine of substitution. Nor is this a vague idea, one that is easy to refine away, or one to which congregations will attach only an indefinite meaning. They at least will understand by it precisely that which their Broad-church teachers have accustomed them to consider at once untrue and dishonouring to God. To us it seems that this heavy burthen is now distinctly bound upon the shoulders of the liberal clergy. They must either bear it

consciously, or consciously throw it off. If, as at present seems too likely, they try to bear it and look as if it were not there, they will succeed in deceiving no one but themselves.

Everything that has yet appeared convinces us that the Broad-church clergy do not appreciate the immense gravity of the situation, or are unwilling to confess it. In the eyes of a large part of the nation, their character for truthfulness, and therefore their whole usefulness (which is built up on a moral foundation), is at stake. The judgment of posterity upon them will, we believe, greatly depend upon their conduct at this turning-point of the Church's fate. Hitherto it has been one of their characteristic principles, that in the matter of articles and creeds and forms of prayer, "the legal was the measure of the moral obligation." For ourselves, we have not only never accepted that principle, but have strongly protested against it; though at the same time we have always respected its acceptance by men in whose probity we had confidence, while entertaining the gravest apprehension as to the consequences of its prevalence as a rule of morals. But what we have now to point out is, that the present Judgment precisely meets this case. It is no longer a question of a private interpretation of the Articles, or of the correct acceptance of a phrase of prayer. The highest court of ecclesiastical law in the land has distinctly said what the Articles mean, and has defined "the legal obligation." Is it possible that we are to see clergymen taking refuge from an unfavourable legal definition in the formerly abandoned width of a moral obligation? After appealing from the court of conscience to the Committee of Council, are they again about to remit the case to what they once declared the lower and less authoritative tribunal?

Two important Judgments of the highest ecclesiastical court have occupied the public mind and disturbed great parties in the Church almost at the same moment. The decision in the Purchas case is being variously met by the persons whom it seems to affect. Many High-churchmen, while very earnestly remonstrating against the hard measure which they conceive to have been dealt out to them, are disposed to obey the law; the more, as this Judgment touches only questions of ritual, and leaves unassailed the doctrines which the ritual symbolizes. If the Bennett case be decided against them, and the Eucharistic doctrine of

the Church of England be interpreted in a more Catholic sense, then, they not obscurely say, they cannot be faithful to a Church which is herself unfaithful to the truth. Some Low-churchmen are willing to accept the surplice in the pulpit, and the cope at high cathedral celebrations, in view of the suppression of ritualistic innovations. But there are many on both sides who protest against a law-abiding policy. Is it quite clear, say some on the Evangelical side, that the Judgment universally enjoins the use of the surplice? Is it quite certain that preaching is "a ministration" of the Church? And then cry the hotter spirits of the Anglican party: "Let us give up nothing of our birthright; let us continue to wear the Eucharistic vestments, to consecrate in front of the altar, to mix water with the sacramental wine in the vestry, and leave it to the Bishops to prosecute us if they dare. If this new Judgment be the law, let the law be penally applied in every individual instance of transgression; and let us see who will accept the responsibility of the cost, the labour, the heart-burning, the scandal, the odium, which must ensue upon the attempt to drive, one by one, a thousand clergy from the Church."

This latter alternative is that for which the Broad-church clergy, so far as they have up to this time indicated their intentions, seem to be prepared in their own case. Every man is to stay in the Church till he is driven out. No Judgment is to have any wider application than the case in which it is pronounced. The lawful conflict of parties is to be turned into the irregular warfare of *franc-tireurs*. A Bishop, with a large income and a persecuting turn of mind, may clear his diocese of Broad-churchmen; or an active clergyman, like the Mr. Fendall who prosecuted Mr. H. B. Wilson, may purify a rural deanery. Here and there will be islands in the waste where, under the palace walls of a Prelate who does not love litigation, or who entertains theories of a comprehension wider than the law provides for, men will be at liberty to read an unchanged Liturgy and preach sermons that contradict it. But then it must not be forgotten that if this theory of the relation of clergymen to the law be once introduced, it will be found to have a universal application. For many years nearly all the prosecutions in the Church have had a Low-church origin: can this state of things continue? When every Anglican, when every Broad-churchmen, feels that he may become any

day the mark for personal attack, will flesh and blood forbear the opportunity of retaliation? Shall we not hear of Evangelical clergymen compelled to read daily prayers, and to administer the bread and wine with a separate exhortation to each communicant? Will not every man's hand be against his brother? There will be "chaos come again;" but hardly the decent order of a Church established by law. Is it worth while to seek to save the Establishment at the cost of revolution? Is it not the strangest of paradoxes, to refuse obedience to the law for the sake of being under the law? The fact is, that these two Judgments, thus regarded by those whom they respectively affect, are the *reductio ad absurdum* of an Established Church.

There is, however, another and a more hopeful view, in which these things are only the beginning of the end. A strong feeling is rising up in the midst of the nation, which asks either that tests shall be wholly abolished, or if maintained, shall be honestly complied with. Men have long understood what was meant by a dogmatic Church, setting up precise standards of belief, and exacting a rigid conformity with them. They are beginning to grasp the conception of a Church which should be based upon only a common Godward affection on the part of its members, and should consciously and distinctly provide for the freest speech within its borders. But they are learning to put less and less faith in a freedom which is founded upon restrictions; in the comprehensiveness of a Church which is limited by Thirty-nine Articles and three Creeds; in the thoroughness of scientific investigation which has to regulate itself by the decisions of a legal court; in the honesty of speech which justifies itself by the accidental omissions of formularies. And so when the change comes it will be in two opposite directions—narrower churches than the Church of England will be founded upon its ruins, but there will be wider churches too; and if freedom is God's law, we cannot doubt which, in the long course of ages, will absorb and win the other. But it is not by waiting upon events that God's sons have ever hastened the coming of His kingdom. The servants of authority turn back their longing eyes to the great communions of the past; the children of freedom know that to cling to the Churches of to-day is to be faithless to the Church of to-morrow.

CHARLES BEARD.

VI.—ON THE USE OF CREEDS IN WORSHIP.

The controversies about the mode of conducting public worship which have recently gone so far to rend the Church of England in sunder, which have convulsed the Church of Scotland, and of the noise of which faint echoes have rung through the chapels of almost all the sects in our land, are the signs of a still deeper controversy which is rapidly arising about the essence of worship itself. Few things are more noticeable in the history of English religious opinion than this: that strife of tongues over trifling points, admitted to be trifling even by the larger minds which have fought about them, has always preceded a struggle about principles. A feeling of reverence also has sometimes led men to wrangle over the outward symbols of what to them is holy, rather than bring into question, before they are forced to do so, the doctrine or principle so symbolized.

Thus it has happened that the eyes of the actors and speakers have been fixed mainly on two points, the immediate position to be defended or attacked, and the further and far more important position, the loss or maintenance of which seemed in some degree involved: less notice has been given to details, in abandoning which, however, a something has been conceded to the other side. A point, not without importance to our present subject, has been tacitly yielded by the High-church party.

Among the earlier numbers of the Tracts for the Times are several papers on Liturgical subjects, and the tone of them all is, that the Prayer Book is as near perfection as it is possible for such a book to be. Even to "disturb" oneself "about"—to "feel fastidious at"—any part of the Service, is to "allow the mind an abuse of reason." It is hinted that none who ask for any alteration are "serious men whose consciences are involuntarily hurt by the things they wish altered," but rather "worldly men, with little personal religion, of lax conversation, and lax professed principles." And this is said, not of doctrinal, but of merely verbal changes.* The ninth Tract is composed of an earnest remonstrance against any attempt to shorten the ser-

* Vol. I. Tract iii. pp. 2, 3.

vices, because as they stand they are much shorter than the canonical "hours" of the primitive Church, together with a brief defence of certain coarse passages selected as Lessons, as being a considerate provision of the Church, to relieve her ministers of the pain of using their own words, and to allow them to shelter their admonitions under the holy and reverend language of inspired Scripture.* Again, in another Tract, public discussion in behalf of change of the Lessons is spoken of as "appealing lightly to the sense of an irreverent, presumptuous age on one of the most sacred of all subjects."† This last quoted Tract is Mr. Keble's, and it will be remembered how the work with which his memory will ever be identified—The Christan Year—was written, or at least its separate Hymns and Poems, were combined to bring out the "soothing character" of the Prayer Book, obviously by him considered as complete and admirable for all purposes of public worship.

In accordance with this enthusiasm for a book whose construction and rules were then for the first time popularly examined and dissected, a daily recitation of the Offices for Morning and Evening Prayer in Church came to be almost a test of adherence to the doctrine of the Tracts. And this was soon felt to be wearisome, even by those most zealous and conscientious in the practice. When, some years ago, one of the most devoted of the early Tractarian band was received into the Roman Church, it is reported that as soon as the solemn service of reception was over, in that moment of relaxation and light-heartedness which comes after long tension of nerve, he said to one of those received with him, "Thank God, we have got rid of 'Dearly Beloved.'" And this feeling did not spring from weariness of mere repetition. Dr. Newman expresses no opinion peculiar to himself, but one shared by most devout Catholic priests, when he writes in "Loss and Gain,"—"I could say masses for ever, and not be tired." It sprung from this that while the Mass, entirely as we disapprove its doctrine, was a great action for the people, or an utter merging of the agent's self in God, from whom came the power to do, and therefore an act of intense personal devotion, the Morning and Evening Services are a mere fusion of certain Monastic Offices, not said,

* Vol. I. Tract ix. pp. 2—4.

† Vol. I. Tract xiii. p. 11.

before the Reformation, except as the Offices of Religious Orders, not popular, nor originally meant to be so, not personal, nor meant to be so, but of which the leading idea is the recitation of Psalms and the reading of Lessons, less with regard to the teaching contained in them, than as part of a course, the whole of which was to be done in a given time, in the recitation of which was a merit apart from any thought of their fitness to the mood or needs of the gathered worshipers.

What converts ventured to express in words, others have shewn by their actions. Thirty-six years have not popularized "Daily Services," even when persons, not undevout, have sufficient leisure to attend them. Among the High-church party, the Communion Service rises ever into greater prominence as *the* worship of each Sunday, if not of each day, and grows more and more like the Mass. The Sermon is the great attraction to the other party: both largely eke out the deficiencies of the appointed form by Hymns. And by either section of the Church, the Order for Morning and Evening Prayer is found quite inadequate to the needs of such special occasions as prove the vitality of religious bodies. In the recent "Twelve Days' Mission," the most popular services seemed to be those in which the traces of the ordinary service were most effectually obliterated. The Church movement which begun in the Tracts and the Christian Year, if it has stirred up religious zeal, may yet have increased superstition and revived almost dead dogma; but its onward march has at least exploded one of the fancies which attended its birth, and we shall hear no more in days to come of our "incomparable Liturgy."

Yet even now we have no doubt that any serious proposition for a real reform of the Prayer Book would meet with strenuous resistance. High-churchmen, we believe, use it as a sort of shield, and claim that, its Offices once recited, they are free to do anything else they may think fit. Low-churchmen fear that any alteration would only be against them. Liberals can have little hope that objectionable dogma will be avoided in any revision, when they see that the slight alterations advised by the Ritual Commission will probably result in a larger reading of chapters from the Revelation, and consequently an increased belief in mischievous eschatological dreams, based on the view cer-

tain to be thus encouraged, that its visions belong to the future, not the past. And such of the laity as feel any keen interest in the worship the Church offers them, are often so hopeless of reform, that they withdraw wholly from a service which does not entirely satisfy their religious needs. Apart from places where intellectual life is vigorous, the apparent apathy of the Church-going laity breeds the suspicion that they are too dull to see the danger of using forms from which the spirit has long since evaporated.

Yet while some of the more earnest of the clergy are resigning their posts in the Church, and some of the more earnest laymen ceasing to attend its worship, we are met by this fact, that so often as a Nonconformist church frames for its use a Liturgy, it is almost certain that the model adopted will be in great measure this same Service; it is felt almost instinctively that if the present organization of the religious world divide itself more and more into two great parties, a free Protestant Church will more easily group itself round some large section of what even now claims to be a national religious community. The "disjecta membra" of old faiths are most beautiful and valuable; it may be possible to free them from all blemishes and arrange them anew, if it be impossible, as probably in these days it is, to construct *de novo* a scheme of worship thoroughly in accordance with our highest conceptions of that Great Being who is the Soul of the universe and the Author of each individual life.

Whatever be the end of our present religious distractions, one thing is certain, that under no conceivable circumstances will the same Form satisfy every mind; there will always be needed a certain self-abandonment on the part of those who join with their fellow-men for public worship. Such self-abandonment is possible when all that is required of the worshiper is, that he should bend himself to a mode of feeling, an attitude of prayer or praise or meditation: it is not possible when propositions hard to understand, about whose moral bearing or historical accuracy there may be grave doubts, are presented as a primary condition of united worship. Such an obstacle to concord and unity is the recitation of Creeds in worship. To the consideration of this point we address ourselves.

From what has been said it will be evident that we start from certain assumptions. That the existing services of the Church of England are not working services for the mass of men who wish to worship; that there is scant hope of any such alteration from within as can make them so; that pressure must come from without; that such a service as devout men of various opinions can share in can be found in the National Church only on a complete reconstruction; that—and this fact we must face—after all, a reformed worship may, in spite of all hopes and endeavours, extrude the "orthodox" members of the dogmatic Churches, who, in all shaking of the individual atoms of which those Churches are composed, tend to gravitate more and more towards one of two centres, an infallible Pope or an infallible Book. Those grouped round either can scarce, we fear, hereafter long join in the worship of those whose fundamental position is, that our growing knowledge of God and the laws of God exclude the conception of an infallible word of God, written or spoken; and that consequently worship must often vary, as it adapts itself to our maturer thoughts of its Object.

It has been said that these services are not popular; but this fact arises far more from the form in which they are cast than from the elements of which they are composed, with the one signal exception of the dogmatic recital of Creeds. There can, we think, be no sort of doubt that the tendency of all non-Catholic worship is to confine itself to praise, prayer, and the listening to reading and oration, to the exclusion of ceremonies which in Catholic worship are assumed to be "means of grace." The Sacramental system has no place. So far as any outward semblance of these rites exists, it is rather in deference to traditional piety, derived from a past age, than any keen and overmastering sense of their present necessity; they tend to become more and more memorials of what has been, than channels of the immediate love of God, or a mode of union with Him. And should this be admitted, we think it can be shewn that the principle involved in the recitation or non-recitation of creeds is the most fundamental of any which may arise in discussing the form of worship most inclusive, most widely acceptable. On any conception of the Supreme Being compatible with worship at all—and the term worship

excludes all merely deprecatory prayer — praise must be addressed to Him; and although praise necessarily assumes certain qualities in the Being praised, and certain functions of His being, not all of which may possibly be admitted by every mind, there will be, on the whole, so general an agreement with regard to His creative, sustentive, inspiring, benignant nature, as not to preclude an attitude of unanimous thanksgiving. In the hymn called Te Deum, many people use the same words with wholly different meanings, and yet do not consider these differences so wide as to destroy the advantges of a common form. For instance, the verses, "To Thee Cherubim and Seraphim continually do cry, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Sabaoth," one worshiper may read into them an expression of belief in certain definite ranks of supernatural beings, engaged in perpetual adoration; and another may take them simply as an assertion that the powers of Nature thus personified bear witness to the holiness of God. Some mental difference with regard to words used must probably ever attend the fact, that language can at best but imperfectly express thought.

Of Prayer, again, may various views be taken. To name two only widely contrasted opinions—it may be held that prayer has a direct action on the Divine Mind, if not of such a nature as to change the Eternal Will, which it were surely impiety to conceive, yet such as to act in union with that Will, so that certain facts only follow a combination of wills, human and divine; or, again, that prayer has simply a "reflex action," and that its only office is to place the soul in an attitude of absolute, childlike dependence on the Being before whom it bows itself. And yet, since the petition, "Thy will be done," underlies every other clause of the Lord's Prayer, "Give us this day our daily bread," not excluded, every prayer constructed in its spirit may be used alike by all who take either view, within the limits of those two contrasted ones we have specified. That audience, whether of Scripture, technically so called, or of an Oration, may afford pleasure and instruction, and may conduce to religious meditation, when the individual members of the congregation hold widely different opinions of the authority of the book read and of the reader or speaker, is so obvious a truth as to need no insistance.

It may, indeed, seem that in almost all conceivable worship there must be certain modes in which the Divine Nature is spoken of, or in which He is addressed, involving the acceptance of propositions which would be denied by many in any mixed multitude. Such are, for example, the favourite orthodox formula by which praise is addressed to the supposed three-fold Personality of God, those in which Jesus is directly named as God, those in which God is approached "through" him. But it may be remembered that the moral effect of these is quite other when they are supported by the formal statement of creeds, and so have the force of reasoned statements addressed to the intellect, and when they are retained as rhetorical expressions appealing to the imagination or the feelings. What is stilted, exaggerated and unnatural in a formal document, becomes natural and harmless, perhaps even praiseworthy and beautiful, when it is simply the language of admiration and affection. Moreover, many expressions to which exceptions may be taken will be found to be simply the language of that Bible which Christendom has universally accepted as its main text-book and fount of devotion; and the sense, therefore, to be placed on such expressions must be, if creeds are removed, that which each mind conceives to be the sense of Scripture using the same or equivalent terms.

It is, however, to be remembered that prayer may bristle with dogmatic assumptions which are not based on Scripture, or not on Scripture as interpreted by the best light of modern thought,—with such terms as Trinity, Atonement, and others. And "If," as has been well said, "prayer transports the mind into its mood of simplest veracity, every orthodox doctrinal phrase must arrest the devotion of an unorthodox person." Neither, again, can it be at all maintained that all Scriptural expressions to or of God can be used by those who do not regard Scripture as a final or infallible authority. The support of creeds once gone, all dogmatic expressions based on creeds must follow, so soon as the general sense of the congregation pronounce them false. Till such sense is ascertained, phrases which arrest devotion are at least rendered less serious and misleading by the above considerations. And since no absolute agreement with a series of propositions on speculative subjects is possible to any large number of persons; since all ad-

dresses to God might be resolved into such propositions; to press the argument of the "mood of simplest veracity," would make all united prayer impossible, however carefully framed. But prayers *are* only thrown into propositions when supported by a creed.

We may now address ourselves more immediately to the consideration of our special question. There are some superstitions which die very hard, of which one is, that the Church of England holds "'the Faith' as it was held by the Church Catholic prior to its division into East and West." But since this very schism was created by the insertion of a clause in the Nicene Creed, which the Eastern Churches have rejected and the Western Church has accepted, the accepting Church is clearly unable to say with any truth that it holds the same formal faith as it did before the addition of this clause. The assertion, first found in the opening clauses of the will of an Anglican divine, and so often quoted since his day, took shape firstly, in all likelihood, from an exaggerated estimate of the value of union with the traditional and historical societies representing Christianity, and a sense of the real isolation of the Church of England alike from the belief of the immediate past, and the growing convictions which would become the real, if not the formal, belief of the future. And it was probably this same feeling, as well as the fact that our Services were derived, as has been said, not only from the Missal, but the Breviary, which led the Anglican reformers to incorporate into the Services three Creeds; to introduce one of them into the Baptismal Office and the Catechism; to deny Christian burial to such as had not in baptism given at least a tacit adhesion to one of them; and to draw up in the Articles not only those same propositions, but many more also; the whole making a body of authoritative dogma which seems intended to comprehend all that has ever been stated by any formal body on any subject of Christian speculation.

It may be necessary to remind our readers that the only Creed recognized by the Eastern Church is the so-called Nicene Creed, *less* the clause containing the assertion that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son as well as the Father; that the only Creed used in the *public* offices of the Roman Church is the same Creed *with* the clause above

mentioned; and that the so-called Apostles' and Athanasian Creeds are inserted only in the Breviary Offices, to be recited by priests and the members of religious orders alone. The great majority of Protestant churches recite no creed. It does not follow, however, that we may not be right in retaining them all; the point can only be decided by any man on a calm study of each of them and their effects; but it may be here remarked that, in spite of the retention of them, the Church of England is alienated from Rome and the East, who will have nothing to say to it, much as some Churchmen desire a nearer and more cordial relation, and that the recitation of these Creeds is one, perhaps even the main, obstacle to a great influx of persons who now stand without the bars of the prison-house, in which, as they conceive, these formularies hold their conforming friends. But if from time to time it is proposed to disregard words which we have inherited from our forefathers, opposition is stirred, not always couched in so grave terms or having so moderate a sound as have the following sentences of Hooker: "These catholic declarations of our belief, delivered by them who were so much nearer than we are unto the first publication thereof, and continuing needful for all men at all times to know, these confessions as testimonies of our continuance in the same faith to this present day, we rather use than any gloss or paraphrase devised by ourselves, which, though it were to the same effect, could not be of the like authority and credit." This appeal to the past is alike that of Hooker, who thought, and of the many who did not think. We must receive a form because the last generation did so; this received it for a like reason; and so in turn till we come to those who must have known better than we.

But if the strength of a chain is only that of its weakest link, it will be seen how very weak is that on which such weight is hung. When we examine how little those who now use the Creeds know of their history, their authorship, their date, why should we suppose that any other generation since that in which they were composed has known more? And if it be found that the Creeds grew accretively, and the stages of their formation can only be discovered by a comparison of many liturgies and many historical records, it will follow that we in these ages may, and probably do, know more of the genesis of Creeds than those who actually

assisted at their formation, who knew, each of them, the origin of no more than the clause then contributed by his own Church or distinguished person of that Church. In the case of an utterly unhistorical age, and few would deny that the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries were such, it is merely to trifle with our intelligence to say that men knew more at those times because they were nearer to the time in which the events spoken of occurred; it would be almost as true to say that the magi necessarily knew more of astronomy than the Astronomers-Royal of Europe, because they lived nearer to the creation of the world.

The names also which the Creeds bear are transmitted to us from the same unhistorical and unreliable ages; and these, though they do not in any degree impose on such persons as have had time and inclination to study the facts, are not without their influence on the large majority who accept without question whatever seems authoritatively stated. People are overwhelmed by the weight of the great name of Athanasius, though they would find it difficult to say who he was, what he did, when he lived, against whom he contended; and they unhesitatingly accept the Creed as being, if not from his hand, at least a summary of his own direct teaching. It is the same with the Apostles' Creed: accepted unthinkingly as being a summary of the special doctrine taught by the apostles, though a moment's consideration would shew that even on that hypothesis it is no complete summary, but that, as we shall presently point out, much that is insisted on in apostolic writings as of the highest importance is omitted, and opinions introduced to which the apostles were utter strangers.

But it is plain that not even those who are influenced by such reasons, or semblance of reasons, would employ them as arguments in any real justification of the retention of these documents. We will see what is urged in favour of the retention of that Creed to which exception is most commonly and most naturally taken, the so-called Athanasian.

No one ventures to appeal to its alleged authorship. Dr. Waterland, by far the most ultra and conservative of all its defenders, does not place its date earlier than A.D. 420. But the fact that the style and phraseology are Latin; that the Greek copies are late, scarce and inaccurate; that it was received into the offices of no Church sooner than the

middle of the seventh century, render it almost impossible to admit that it was earlier than the middle of the sixth century. For the grounds above given, then, it has no force because it is old; nor is this really urged alone by any of its Anglican defenders. Their views are shortly but ably summed up by Dean Hook in his Church Dictionary, himself being its strong adherent. We epitomize them still further. *Waterland* thinks that its sudden spread among the Western churches, so soon as once it was known, unimposed by any General Council, is a guarantee for its own intrinsic worth; and, moreover, that it came to "perfection" at once, instead of being the slow growth of years. To this it may be enough to answer, that unless we are prepared to accept the whole theology of the churches of France, Germany, Italy, and England at that time, the fact that this Creed formed a part of that theology is not necessarily in its favour; while, unless such a document was drawn up under immediate divine inspiration, its definite decision on so many intricate and subtle questions is less to be trusted than solutions which had been gradually elaborated through a long series of years. *Dean Vincent* argues, that as "Luther, Calvin, Beza, and all the wisest and best reformers, acknowledged the Athanasian Creed, and made it their profession of faith;" as "the Puritans embraced it as readily as the Church of England," we ought to have no difficulty. Now not to reject a Creed is not the same thing as to acknowledge it, nor are we in these days to admit that those who laid the foundations of reformation completed their work. It was no part of the plan of the Reformers abroad or of the Puritans at home to alter the doctrinal standards they found. It was rather to free the doctrine therein contained from the accretions of mediæval theology, and still more from those of mediæval practice, that they complained of existing corruptions; and it is only now these are cleared away that we their descendants are able to distinguish that those who did such good service spared the stock from which those corruptions sprang. *Hey* says that "whoever wrote this Creed meant nothing more than to collect things said by various Catholic writers against the various heresies subsisting, and to simplify and arrange the expressions, so as to form a confession of faith, the most concise, orderly and comprehensive possible." If this be "simplicity," what

is complexity? The arguments of other authorities quoted by Dean Hook, both on the Creed in general and on the damnatory clauses in particular, resolve themselves into this, that they do not attempt to explain mysteries, but merely state what Scripture states; and that having laid down the faith in the words of Scripture, the damnatory clauses are certainly no stronger than is the assertion in St. Mark's Gospel, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark xvi. 16). Waiving the question whether, indeed, this verse be any part of the authentic Gospel of Mark (and it is not found in the Sinaitic or Vatican MSS.), we may point out that it is certainly unique, and that it is a most dangerous plan to rely on one only text for the support of a dogmatic statement, especially one of so tremendous a character; and that even if it be true that each proposition in the Creed is based on Scripture, it is not the same thing to accept those propositions each in its place in Scripture qualified by the context, time and place of writing, character and ability of the writer, and nakedly, absolutely, as they are presented in the Creed.

These considerations would weigh, as it seems, with unprejudiced scholars, who are not misled by false interpretations of the meanings of words. But it may farther be a question whether, in a form of service for the people, it can be right to retain a document which it is wholly impossible that the people should understand. Let it be remembered that in the Latin language, in the mediæval philosophy, in the scholastic theology, which imposed their own thought on the propositions of the Creed, even if those propositions were earlier in order of time, the terms employed had a very different meaning from what they now have, and that, to the minds of all who are not thoroughly acquainted with ecclesiastical Latin, thoroughly imbued with the spirit of that philosophy and theology, the words "person," "substance," "incomprehensible," "reasonable," present not only other, but opposite meanings to those which they are meant to have in the Creed. They tend to foster a material tritheism, against which it is the whole intention of the Creed vehemently to protest. Thus, even were we to admit that all statements of Scripture might be made foundation for dogma, and that the mediæval theology

ought to influence modern thought, the Creed would be open to grave difficulties of acceptation, as founded on an imperfect basis of texts, couched in the technical terms of a philosophy dead and buried beyond hope of resuscitation. Even on such hypotheses, the Creed were inexcusable. Much more, then, would all liberal reformers claim its exclusion from worship on the far higher and more absolute ground, that its dogmatic clauses are wholly inconsistent with any rational conception of the Divine Nature, and answer to no known facts of life, divine or human; while they would reject its damnatory clauses as statements utterly alien to what our Father-God has taught us of Himself by the silent witness in our heart, even though an angel from heaven were to assert the authority of each audacious thesis.

The Council at Nicæa, in Bithynia, held A.D. 325, and that of Constantinople A.D. 381, are jointly responsible for the symbol which derives its name from Nicæa. This was not, as it may seem to some, an expansion of the Apostles' Creed, for it received its final and complementary touches in the fifth century, many years before the Apostles' Creed appears for the first time,—in the form it has since preserved,—in the commencement of the sixth century. But there can be no doubt that both are expansions, under different circumstances and different influences, of some simple formula of Christian faith used almost from the Church's beginning. The question in each case will be, whether the circumstances which necessitated, or seemed to necessitate, these expansions are as important to us as to the framers of the Creeds; for, let it be again repeated, no antiquity, even the very highest, no prescription, ought to have weight sufficient to induce the retention of a formula which it is found desirable to abolish. Let us have done with shams. If we *really* reverence the Councils of Nicæa and Constantinople, we may consent to be bound by their decisions; if we know little of them and do not reverence them, let us not be imposed on by the sound of their names, like the simple village woman who was persuaded of the learning of a sermon she did not understand because it contained the abstruse word Mesopotamia.

Of the Council of Nicæa, Dr. Mosheim says, in words wherein he curiously contradicts himself:

"The Council assembled by Constantine at Nice is one of the

most famous and interesting events that are presented to us in ecclesiastical history; and yet, what is more surprising, there is no part of the history of the Church that has been unfolded with such negligence, or rather passed over with such rapidity. The ancient writers are neither agreed concerning the time nor place in which it was assembled, the number of those who sat in council, nor the bishop who presided in it. No authentic acts of its famous sentence have been committed to writing, or at least none have been transmitted to our times."*

And though it is true we know somewhat more of the Council held at Constantinople, when we remember the eagerness with which whatever had once been decided on the orthodox side was received, we shall not attribute too great importance to the fact that the second Council ratified and extended what had been laid down by the former, nor assume too readily that the Constantinopolitan bishops were extremely critical as to the manner in which orthodox resolutions had been carried at Nice. These resolutions were framed against the tenets of Arius. Of him, Mosheim again says:

"He maintained that the Son was totally and essentially distinct from the Father, that he was the first and noblest of those beings whom God the Father had created out of nothing, the instrument by whose subordinate operation the Almighty Father formed the universe, and therefore inferior to the Father both in nature and in dignity. His opinions concerning the Holy Ghost are not so well known. It is, however, certain that his notion concerning the Son of God was accompanied and connected with other sentiments that were very different from those commonly received among Christians, though none of the ancient writers have given us a complete and coherent system."†

The opinions which he held are thus epitomized by Spanheim, and, subject to the uncertainty which attaches to most of the history of that period, the epitome may be accepted as a fair statement.

"The Arian principles were, that Christ was only called God by way of title; that he was less than the Father, who only was eternal and without beginning; that he was a creature, having a beginning of existence, created out of things, having no being before the beginning of all things; hence he was made God, and

---

* Mosheim, Eccl. Hist., trans. Maclaine: London, 1825, Vol. I. p. 414.

† Ibid. Vol. I. p. 412.

the Son of God by adoption, not by nature; and that the Word was also subject to change; that the Father created all things by him as an instrument, and that he was the most excellent of all creatures; that the essence of the Father was different from the essence of the Son, neither was he co-eternal, co-equal nor consubstantial with the Father; that the Holy Ghost was not God, but the creature of the Son, begot and created by him, inferior in dignity to the Father and the Son, and co-worker in the creation."

Now though there are some in our days whom a perverse and wanton ignorance pretends to brand with the name Arian, it must be obvious to all who gain ever so faint a knowledge of what were Arius' true tenets, that they answer in no degree to the theology of any existing sect. It is plain that if there were such, the hindrances to united worship might rather come from them than from liberal Christians, who would consider Arians orthodox. But all who would, like ourselves, welcome to united worship those who go much further than Arius, and break down all barriers which divide us, would have been against the imposition of the Nicene Creed in earlier days, and would plead earnestly for its abolition now. There can be no doubt that its metaphysical propositions, especially those about the pre-existent nature of the Son, are stumbling-blocks to many devout persons, who think them opposed to the due subordination of Jesus, which they hold because of their overmastering belief of the supreme sovereignty of God the Father.

For our own particular, our objection to the use of Creeds at all swallows up the consideration of many points which might here be urged. It is easy for the minister of any congregation of the Church of England to disregard the Rubric bidding him read the Athanasian Creed, nor would he consider that in so doing he was guilty of grave disobedience. But it is not possible for any to avoid the use of the Nicene Creed. Those, therefore, who, while desiring to be free from the compulsion of such documents, believe that they would weaken the liberal cause within the Church, and delay still further a reconstruction which may be imminent, by secession, dwell rather on the similarities than the dissimilarities of the Nicene and Apostles'

Creeds, and would justify their own use of the former by some such words as follow. They would say that "I believe in *one* God," and "I believe in God," are for all Christians, all Mahometans, and many beyond these nominally monotheistic religions, absolutely the same statements; nor do the words, "And of all things visible and invisible," add any idea to modern ears and thought which is not conveyed in the preceding clause. The articles respecting Jesus Christ are far more expanded in the Nicene symbol than in the Apostles'; but it may be questioned whether the single word "only" in the latter does not cover the whole of the doctrine asserted with so great minuteness in the former. If but "divinity" and not deity is predicated of Christ under the word "only," it may be maintained without paradox that the same limitation is still more conveyed in the words, "God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God," "Deus ex Deo," in which whatever is said of the Father absolutely is at most said derivatively only of the Son. And what was urged with regard to the Athanasian Creed will also here apply, that these several propositions are contained in the Bible, and therefore may be understood with all those qualifications which adhere to them in their place in Scripture. The expansion of the article concerning the Holy Ghost is no doubt full of difficulty, and appears to demand assent to statements not contained in Scripture, and as such to be avoided. Yet we are not called on, if we retain creeds at all, to rend the Church for anything so obscure as the "procession" of the Spirit from Jesus Christ, who unquestionably was full of the Spirit of God, and who imparted a something of the Spirit that was in him to others. Nor in ascribing honour and glory to God, the great Spiritual Being, can we well fail to give that honour and glory to His Spirit. Provided we accept dogma stated in formal propositions at all, provided we admit that difficult metaphysical terms are ever suitable to describe the nature of Him whom all can know by the heart and none can know by the intellect, there is to many no overwhelming difficulty in the Nicene Creed under the qualifications here insisted on. Of course such reduction of the propositions of the Creed to the measure of Scripture will only satisfy those who hold, and so long

as they hold, Scripture to be the fount of devotional expressions. Yet such tenet by no means implies an overweening sense of the authority of Scripture, or that its expressions are binding on conscience. What was said under the head of the Athanasian Creed on this subject applies here also. And it must be fully granted that to many minds the difficulties of each individual proposition are enormous, though these difficulties are not so onerous to those who have grown up in the use of the Creed, and having in some degree submitted their minds to its influence, have also, unconsciously, bent the meaning of its words to suit their growing thought, till their thought and the words of the Creed are so interlaced, that it may at times be difficult for themselves to see if, and how far, they have wrested the words from the meaning they would bear if now they came to them from without.

To them the real difficulty is acceptance of dogma stated in formal propositions at all. If the Athanasian and Nicene Creeds were removed from the Services to-morrow,—the clamour once over which such a measure would entail,—the few, who would leave the Church of England on that ground alone, out of it,—the orthodox party would maintain that all that had been held was still stated in the Apostles' Creed, and, save the "damnatory clauses," they would not be far wrong; while those who expected to find heavy chains removed would feel those which remain are in fact just those which gall. And since we object to the principle involved in the recitation of any Creed whatever, even were we to grant that the great majority of Christians hold the words of the Apostles' Creed in the same sense, or that it is entitled to universal respect for its own sake, or as representing the unquestioned sense of Scripture, we must examine this Creed in detail.

The most exhaustive book on the subject is that of M. Michel Nicolas,* to which, and to a recent critique in these pages, we refer our readers with full confidence. Few who examine its history will hesitate to dismiss utterly and for ever any lingering remains of a superstition about

---

* Le Symbole des Apôtres, Essai Historique, par Michel Nicolas. Paris, 1867.

the apostolic origin of the Apostles' Creed when once they recognize the fact that it was never heard of for four hundred years after the apostles had all passed away.

But if not framed by them, at least it represents their doctrine? It does nothing of the sort. We do not of course deny that it includes many statements of facts, many religious ideas which formed a part of their teaching. But, on the one hand, there are doctrines they did not know, and others of which they formed to themselves a wholly different conception; and, on the other hand, doctrines are wanting to which they attached immense importance. These differences are mainly in the fourth part of the Creed, that which is concerned with the Church. Here at once the word "Catholic" is in direct contradiction with apostolic faith. For the apostles expected, with an intensity which we can scarce imagine, the immediate return of the Master they had lost. The Son of Man was to come before they had gone through the cities of Israel. A Catholic Church would have been a heresy to the Judaizing party among the early Christians, that is to all but the Pauline party; and even St. Paul's most earnest words are constantly finished and summed up in the warning "Maranatha," or the Lord is at hand. The imminence of the second advent is the burthen alike of St. Paul's Epistles and the intensely narrow and Jewish Apocalypse. With St. Paul there was no time, with St. John was neither room nor time, for the spread of a Catholic Church. Again, the Creed, as recited in church, speaks of a "resurrection of the body;" but the version in the Baptismal Service, and in that for the Visitation of the Sick, has it, the "resurrection of the flesh,"—"carnis," not "corporis resurrectionem;" and this no doubt is the way in which most people understand the words; they would not easily perceive that an important distinction might be drawn between the two. Moreover, "the flesh" is a right translation of the words of the Creed, of which one version, that formerly in use at Aquileia, defines the meaning still further, and speaks of "this flesh." This opinion has worked itself into the fancies, we can hardly say the faiths, of men. Thousands of good people who profess to believe the Bible—thousands who consider each word that St. Paul wrote was directly revealed by God,

expect that the very flesh which rots in the grave will re-live, and that the dry bones, or those which have become dust of the earth, or have passed into the roots and stems of the plants which grow there, will cohere once more as in Ezekiel's dream. Yet what says St. Paul? "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." According to him, it is not what we call the body which will re-live, but a spiritual body, which he seems to think even now co-exists with the material body, from which it will be freed at death. This teaching of the apostle, surely in harmony with many of the words of Jesus on the subject, is directly contrary to what the Creed affirms. Few persons have more strongly protested against the material resurrection than S. T. Coleridge, and of living divines Mr. Maurice is he who has caught most of that master's spirit. What he says of the fancy of revivified flesh is well worth quoting.

"As long as we suppose the mystery of death to be the division of soul and body, so long we must cling with a deep love to those remains which yet we are forced to regard with a kind of loathing. We shall be ready to believe stories of miracles wrought by them: we shall be half inclined to worship them. Or if we reject this temptation—because Romanists have fallen into it, and we think it must therefore be shunned—we shall take our own Protestant way of asserting the sanctity of relics, by maintaining that at a certain day they will all be gathered together, and that the very body to which they once belonged will be reconstructed out of them. That immense demand is made upon our faith—a demand in comparison of which all notions of cures wrought at tombs fade into nothing—by divines who would shrink instinctively from saying that what they call a living body here is a mere congeries of particles—who would denounce any man as a materialist if he said that. This demand is made upon us by divines who use as a text-book of Christian evidences 'Butler's Analogy,' the ground chapter of which, 'On the Future State,' is based on the argument that there is no proof that death destroys any of our living powers—those of the body more than those of the soul—and which distinctly calls our attention to the fact, that ordinary attrition may destroy the particles of which the matter of our bodies consists, more than once in the course of a life, so that nothing can be inferred from our depositing the whole of that matter at the moment of dissolution. This demand is made on our faith by divines, who read to every mourner as he goes with them to the grave of a friend, that corruption can-

not inherit incorruption, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God."*

In so far, then, as this Creed has caused the acceptance of a faith opposed to that of St. Paul, it is not apostolic; while to some its statements appear to mislead, in that they contradict science and philosophy.

After these two instances, we need scarcely press the further question whether the words, I believe in "the Communion of Saints," I believe in "the Forgiveness of Sins," mean in the Creed anything like what they meant or could have meant from apostolic lips.

And if this form contains doctrines unknown to or contradictory to those of the apostles, there are many important points omitted which would surely be taught in any true summary of the doctrines of Jesus' immediate followers. There is nothing said of regeneration, sanctification, justification, redemption—words which, however we may explain them, represent capital doctrines in the Epistles. It is, in fact, perfectly certain that this Creed, like the others of which we have spoken, was an expansion from the extremely simple formula proposed for the acceptance of catechumens in the early Church, that those expansions were made to meet heresies, and those clauses are least expanded which were least disputed.

The following facts, then, seem clear on an historical examination of this Creed. 1. It only appears, in any form whatever, in the second half of the third century; its present form was only fixed in the sixth century. 2. It was never in use in all churches, and since the formation of the Creed of Nicæa or Constantinople has not been known in the East. 3. From the first moment of its appearance we find it under sensibly different forms. 4. It does not contain a true statement of apostolic doctrine. 5. "Its only use is," as says M. Nicolas, "to afford a list of the successive formation of Christian beliefs, during the ages which witnessed its birth and development."

We propose now to examine this Creed, clause by clause, and to shew that those who retain its use are not agreed in the meanings in which they use it, so that its original purpose as a test of uniformity falls to the ground, while it

---

* Maurice's Theological Essays, 2nd edition, pp. 168, 169.

remains a grievous barrier to those who object to all seeming tests of uniformity. Those who dwell within the shadow of its clauses may have grown to think them as the walls of some idle Bastille, whose doors and windows gape wide, whose fetters have grown rusty with use; yet none the less will they aid those coming from without to pull it down, those who will not dwell under its shadow, and refuse to believe that what was built as a prison can ever be the home of the free.

"I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth," is a statement which would generally be accepted without question by all Theists. Yet in the last part might arise a doubt, not without growing importance in these days, whether we can indeed speak of God as "*Maker* of heaven" in the same sense as we speak of Him as "Maker of earth." If, indeed, "heaven and earth" are merely an equivalent for "the universe," well and good; but not so all understand it. And though, perhaps, none who use the words intelligently would consider that herein is given any sanction to the notion of an over-arching material vault, yet there certainly may herein be discovered sanction for the idea of a space or place in which is a local and perhaps a material heaven, which others, believers in God also, and in immortality, would shrink from recognizing. They who would say with Bishop Ken,

> "Heaven is, dear Lord, where'er Thou art:
> Oh never then from me depart,
> For to my soul 'tis Hell to be
> But for one moment without Thee,"

would not always be willing to admit that God "made heaven" as they would allow He made earth. Thus words bear an ambiguous meaning, even in that part of the Creed least open to cavil.

"And in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord." Here arise at once a great number of divergences. In these days, few, if any, would be found who deny the real historical existence of Jesus of Nazareth. All therefore, in some sense, "believe in him." But the word is applied to him as to God the Father. Now there are all shades of belief in him, from the assertion of his equality and oneness with God the Father, which certainly is implied in the arrange-

ment and use of the words, down to the mere admission that he was born and lived and died. Nor does the term Christ which qualifies Jesus really solve the difficulty. It may indeed be said that the name Jesus is that of the historical personage, and Christ that which asserts his proper divinity, if not his deity; but the distinction, if once it existed, cannot now be pressed. If we take up a volume of Catholic literature, we find hymns of the most orthodox character addressed to Jesus as God, and French nuns heading their correspondence with the words, "Vive Jesus;" while the Westminster Review does not for a moment hesitate to speak of "Christ's teaching." So, then, this word may be taken either as including all that can be meant in the phrase, "the anointed of God" or "Messiah," or as merely avowing the indisputable fact that he has been recognized as such by a vast majority of his followers. "His only Son," again, may mean anything, from the full admission of the deity of Jesus, to the mere assertion that his life and character are unique in the history of the world; and "Lord" imply his absolute, unconditioned sovereignty, or the willing submission of our hearts to the tender grace and beauty of that life and character, as we strive to make ourselves like him.

"Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost." We are brought here face to face with the first of the two great difficulties attaching to the life of Jesus as recorded in the Gospels, and with the fact that many Christians reject as wholly incredible the accounts of the miraculous birth of Christ given in Matthew and Luke, but never again alluded to by them, and, as would appear, entirely unknown to every other writer in the New Testament. Yet many who in modern days, headed by the honoured name of S. T. Coleridge, would decline to accept these two statements, that the birth of Jesus was different in its physical accidents from that of any other, would by no means hesitate to see in that and all births the energizing of that great Spirit which, flowing from God the Creator, is the "giver of life," —that force which, acting under conditions as yet imperfectly understood, reproduces life to supply the waste of death, the *natura naturans*, which did we know fully all mysteries of life and creation would lie unveiled to view. "Born of the Virgin Mary." From those who hold that

Mary gave birth to Jesus "illæsâ virginitate," who could say with Mr. Keble,

"And even as when her hour was come, He left His mother mild,
A royal Virgin evermore, heavenly and undefiled,"*

through those who affirm that, though Jesus was miraculously born, Mary *afterwards* bore children to Joseph, to many who accept the word simply as a description of the historic Mary of Nazareth, the difference is indeed vast; yet these last, with no shadow of conscious insincerity, use the words without even thinking of the, to them, exaggerated and dishonouring Catholic interpretation.

The next clauses, which are simply historical, need not detain us a moment. There can be no essential difference in the interpretation of the words, "Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried;" for we need scarce even allude to the view of some, that the death of Jesus was no real death. It is only an awkward mode of escaping from the difficulties of the story of the resurrection, by the invention of quite gratuitous difficulties at a step further back in the history, where there are naturally the fewest possible. But of the words, "He descended into hell," who shall give any explanation that can truly satisfy his own mind or that of any other? M. Athanase Coquerel dismisses them boldly in one contemptuous sentence, or rather parenthesis ("car personne n'y croit");† and whoso has a religion as manly and robust as his, no doubt feels with him about the historical interpretation. Yet if the clause be retained by any Church, those who remain in it have to find an explication, if they would not repeat words parrot-wise. Bishop Pearson, having made a struggle, but all in vain, to swallow, as he usually is able to do, Patristic teaching on this head, concludes in words which may be probably taken to express the orthodox view of those who are able to understand him.

"I give a full and undoubting assent unto this as to a certain truth, that when all the sufferings of Christ were finished on the

---

* Lyra Innocentium, Poem on Easter Day.

† Discours d'Inauguration, &c. Paris, 1870.

Cross and his soul was separated from his body, though his body were dead, yet his soul died not, and though it died not, yet it underwent the condition of the souls of such as die, and being he died in the similitude of a sinner his soul went to the place where the souls of men are kept who died for their sins, and so did wholly undergo the law of death: but because there was no sin in him, and he had fully satisfied for the sins of others which he took upon him; therefore as God suffered not his Holy One to see corruption, so he left not his soul in hell, and thereby gave sufficient security to all those who belong to Christ, of never coming under the power of Satan, or suffering in the flames prepared for the Devil and his angels."*

This is, indeed, an answer like the one which

"— pealed from that high land,
But in a tongue no man could understand;"

and the only plainer one which can be given is, that it is for us either a tautological repetition of the former clause, to which, though idle, few would object, or, as has been said, "the relic of an effete superstition which may be left to crumble away."

"The third day He rose again from the dead." There is scarce any subject in the whole world's history on which the minds of men are in so great suspense as this. We do not speak of the many who do not think, and who therefore find no difficulties in anything, however incredible in itself, which is told them with any semblance of authority, or of that other many who will not think lest they should err from the faith; but even among the orthodox are those who are fully alive to the enormous difficulties which beset each step of the narratives in the Gospels. But, again, liberal thinkers are by no means satisfied with the attempts which have been and are made to explain and account for the occurrences recorded to have taken place in Jerusalem within a day or two of the crucifixion of Jesus. It seems as well attested a fact as any in history, that he was thought to be alive by some who had seen him die. And every hypothesis which attempts to account for this, seems to present quite equal difficulties, if not greater than those

* Pearson on the Creed, Vol. I. p. 295. Oxford, 1847.

involved in any one of the narratives given us in the Gospels, if not equal to those involved in all of them taken together. And the words just quoted express not only the rigid belief of the orthodox, but are used by many as a convenient formula, in which are held in solution and suspense every conceivable notion floating through the brains of such as dare not venture to pronounce, in other words than those which have already many meanings, a definite opinion.

"He ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father." What is to ascend, and where or what is heaven? It is obvious that the mere words apply equally to a bodily or a spiritual ascension, to a heaven which is or can be the home of a material body, or to a heaven which is simply another term for being with God. And in all senses which these opposites include are the words used by those who recite them, while all men would unite in considering any phrase which ascribes to the Father localization and a bodily presence to be mere figure.

"From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead." These words are again under the disadvantage of being ambiguous till we can agree on the meaning of heaven, and so can limit the word "thence." Yet if this seem too trivial to dwell upon, the coming of Christ to judgment obviously includes, not only the views of those who take the visions of the Revelation as susceptible of an actual and future fulfilment, and liken the judgment of God to a great assize, in which Christ, his Father's delegate, shall sit as a stern Judge, with power at once to decide and sentence, but also those who regard all social, political and religious changes as comings of Christ, which try the living and pass judgment on the dead.

"I believe in the Holy Ghost," may include any form of faith, from the pseudo-Athanasian doctrine on the subject, to the simple recognition of a Divine Spirit energizing in what we call nature and in man.

"I believe in the holy Catholic Church," is either the expression of a devout Catholic, or a mere assent to an historical fact, of a firm conviction of the holiness of a society more than human, divinely inspired, or the formal admission of a distinguishing title, like the "holy Roman Em-

peror," or once "his Sacred Majesty," some worthless Charles or James.

In his admirable Bampton Lectures, devoted to a consideration of this one clause, Mr. H. B. Wilson has shewn us the vague and unsettled character of the explanations which the words, "I believe in the Communion of Saints" have received; but he has made it clear that meanings are, as a fact, placed on it, varying between the declaration that we have an interest in the prayers of saints, or that we are linked together with all Churchmen, living and dead, to God by some mystic sacramental ties, and that of considering the saints as a mere cohesion of men who desire to live a religious life within the nominal bounds of some regular and organized Church.

"The forgiveness of sins" may and does include all "schemes of salvation," sacramental systems, priestly absolutions, penances, indulgences, and the like; or, free from evangelical or sacerdotal theories, express a simple trust in a Father's love.

What has been said of the "Resurrection of the Body" already will shew how widely separated are the faiths which shelter under the same words; nor would any, save the very few who dogmatize affirmatively on annihilation, or suspend their judgment with regard to a future state, hesitate to declare their belief in "life everlasting."

In reference to the extreme latitude of explanation of some of the clauses above, it may no doubt be urged with great force that no words yield, or ought to yield, a plurality of senses, save where they are in themselves hopelessly ambiguous, and that no one can pretend that the phrases in question have any such ambiguity. But our contention is, that the Church of England which now imposes these Creeds, has by its Articles wrested some of the clauses from their original meaning. M. Nicolas has shewn conclusively that when the clause of the descent into hell first appeared, it was intended to involve the doctrine of Purgatory; and when that of the communion of saints is first found, it is interpreted, not in reference to the general community of interests which belong to Christian people, but with regard to certain particular relations supposed to exist between the living and the dead. These interpretations the Church of

England has formally excluded by the twenty-second Article. It has taken an old document and excluded the old sense, placing on it a new one, plainly not the only one the words will bear; much as the evangelists adopted old prophetic sayings, wrested wholly away from their original meaning. And the extremest latitude of use is simply the carrying out a plan already adopted. It is not pretended that this is "interpretation," or attempting to discover the original meaning; but since this original meaning is excluded, some meaning must be found so long as words are used at all. What harm, then, does it if men of so widely differing opinions may be contained within its loosened bonds? This harm, that a Creed gives a semblance of unity where none exists; it teaches men to rely on outward uniformity, rather than on a true union of the heart in sympathy and in love for God and man. It unites us, some will say, with the past, and ensures the continuity of the Church. Religious thought is and must be continuous; but it is because of the change, and not because of the persistence of Creeds, which can merely give the thought of the present the false appearance of the thought of the past. And since our modern ideas of God by no means come through traditional and historical channels only, it is a mistake to recite one source of our views alone, if we recite any at all. To be consistent and complete, we should have to formularize also the beliefs in order, law and development, at least as dear to the natural philosopher as is that of the personality of God to the Christian theologian.

When the first short and simple Creeds were adopted in the Christian Church, they were truly what they have ever been called, symbols, watch or pass-words. The Church was indeed an Ecclesia, called out in danger and distress, maintaining an existence with difficulty, obliged to hide itself underground before it could germinate and grow. Afterwards, what had been a necessity was continued by choice. The Church was pleased to think that its members were "of God," and that the whole world "lay in wickedness," and the pass-word was still the test of admission into the great society which only could be saved in the coming storms. But we recognize neither the need nor the lawfulness of concealing our views, and so need no secret society

to shelter us, nor do we think that one only fold, one system or scheme of doctrine, can hold or can instruct all the children of God.

And then, as the power of the Church increased, and dreams of future glory paled before still less noble visions of earthly aggrandizement, it became in its turn a persecutor, and the old watchword became a war-cry, under whose fierce influence every fanatical persecution, from the Crusades to our own day, has shouted for the battle. But we again are no proselytizers. Let God teach His children as He pleases, and let His children seek the light, with no foregone conclusion that they shall find it in one only direction. All attempts to force men to see as we see, to look where we look, must proceed from an inborn sense of insecurity in our own convictions, even when they seem most strong.

Worship needs no creeds. We do not require of each member of a loving family on earth that he or she shall put into the same formula his or her conception of the character of the father, husband, master of the household; nor does he, to shed his affection and justice forth, require such an idle test. Nor can we, who can think of God only from what we know of Man, deem that our Father in heaven requires such identity of intellectual conviction in us, which would barter the infinite diversity in which He has created us for the drilled and orderly yet lifeless movement of the wheels of a machine. "Tanquam cadaver" is not a motto for Protestants, as it is for the great Society which arrogates to itself the peculiar name of Jesus. Because we believe that God lives, and that "all but God is changing day by day," we live also, and we prove our vitality by our changes of form and of attitude towards the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.

We plead, then, for the disuse of Creeds in worship,—

Because, as we believe, the faith of many men has drifted away from the faith of dogmatic Churches, never more to return.

Because those who, within the Churches, adhere to the old historic interpretations, are thereby placed in a position of strong antagonism to nature and to fact.

Because those who, within the Churches, adhere to the old words to clothe new thought, could find far better words to fit the thought than those which have ever over them a shadow of past meanings.

Because, while many are unwilling to break with a Church which is doing much for Christian liberty, and might afford a rallying-ground for Christians unattached, the rings of broken fetters have some weight still, which may hereafter prove insupportable.

Because, above all, while those who have grown up in a position which they only gradually understand, are able to justify to themselves their retention of it, they cannot expect the same acquiescence in that position from new comers.

If the foregoing pages shall have helped any towards a firmer standing-ground than is afforded by the shifting sands of uncertain Creeds, the writer's aim is answered. He well knows that for practical changes we must often wait long, and in patience possess our souls. Such considerations as here are urged cannot fail to give pain to many devout souls, whom to save from suffering one would fain be silent. Yet some pain is salutary, and such is that which always attends the transition from weakness and dependence to a fuller and more vigorous life.

C. Kegan Paul.

VII.—NOTICES OF BOOKS.

1. *The Hebrew Prophets, translated afresh from the Original, with regard to the Anglican Version, and with Illustrations for English Readers.* Vol. II. By the late Rowland Williams, D.D. London: Williams and Norgate. 1871.

In an earlier volume of this Review* I had the pleasure of noticing the first volume of this work, which was remarkable as shewing that the critical study of the Hebrew Scriptures had begun to be pursued seriously even by the clergy of the English Church, amongst whom the mere knowledge of their language has for many generations been at a disgracefully low ebb. It was also remarkable for taking up the study not with philological views merely, —to present a better translation,—but for its attention to historical criticism and consequent endeavour to ascertain the bearing of each passage in its context, and for its rearrangement of the chapters and verses, especially in Isaiah, the chief book with which it dealt. After an interval of five years, the second volume is now sent into the world as a parting gift from the author, who has not been permitted to finish his task, or to give to this section the final revision and completeness which it would undoubtedly have received at his hands.

The first volume bore as a second title "The Prophets of Israel and Judah during the Assyrian Empire," and included Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Hosea, Micah, Isaiah (ch. i.—xxxix.) and Nahum. The second is lettered outside, "Babylonian and Persian Empire," and includes Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Jeremiah, Lamentations and Ezekiel (ch. i.—iv.). Thus the work still wants, and always will want, Isaiah ch. xl.—lxvi., Ezekiel ch. v.—xlviii., Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi; not to mention Jonah and Daniel, which Dr. Williams possibly had no intention of including. Besides this, there is no Introduction to Ezekiel, and as Mrs. Williams (who edits the volume) remarks, "we also miss the summary at the conclusion, which would probably have surveyed the ground

---

* Vol. III. 1866.

gone over, and touched on those religious topics which the criticism and commentary had thrown light upon."

These irretrievable omissions are sorely to be lamented, but do not detract from the value of what has really been completed by the author. Each prophet is a personality who can be studied by himself, and without reference to his successors; and as the prophets have been taken in chronological order, the historical picture is complete as far as it goes. The form and style of translation are the same as in the previous volume, and the care bestowed on the arrangement of the longer books, and the discovery of later interpolations, is in both equally admirable. The author makes clear that the longer books, such as Isaiah and Jeremiah, consist of short pieces, some of only a few verses, tacked together with no critical skill and with utter ignorance of chronological propriety. This is especially the case in Jeremiah, and there the important differences of the Septuagint, which often presents a better order than the Hebrew, prove the Hebrew text in its present state to be of no great antiquity. It must, however, be understood that Dr. Williams is not himself the originator of most of these re-arrangements. They are mainly due to the acute mind of Ewald, who has perhaps nowhere found a labour more suited to his peculiar insight into ancient writers than in his treatment of the Prophets. It is perhaps better that the English public should be introduced to them by an original translation by a scholar of English reputation than by a translation from Ewald's German version. As to the translation itself, it appears to me executed rather too much "with regard to the Anglican version." While on the one hand it retains language that is often obscure or grammatically faulty, it introduces some phrases which have an air of oddity about them that mars the effect and makes us feel as if we were reading a translation made by a foreigner, or by one who cares less for presenting the true sense than the really untranslatable grammatical forms of the Hebrew author. Thus the expression נְאֻם יי, which the Authorized Version paraphrases by "saith the LORD," appears here as "is JEHOVAH'S saying," which becomes intolerably burdensome when occurring so frequently as it does in Jeremiah; while it says no more than the simpler phrase. Had the translator regarded the word נאם, which is a solemn one,

only used of Divine declarations, as more than a mere *saying*, and translated "is Jehovah's *oracle*," I should not have had this objection to urge. There is a hesitancy in the rendering of the Divine name in both volumes which I cannot account for. The name JHVH is rendered *ad libitum* "Jehovah" and "The Eternal." This is a retrogression from the Authorized Version, which consistently renders the word "The LORD" in capitals. In the notes the term Jehovah appears to be exclusively used. The treatment of the participial construction after הִנֵּה is a delicate point, and the Authorized Version generally requires correction, but it may be doubted whether Dr. Williams's translation is either the best rendering of the Hebrew or the best English: see Jer. xix. 3, "Behold I will bring evil upon this place," Authorized Version; "Behold me bringing evil upon this place," Dr. Williams. In my judgment, "Here am I bringing (or about to bring)" would be better in both respects. In xviii. 3, Dr. Williams inconsistently follows the Authorized Version, and says, "I went down to the potter's house, and behold, he wrought a work," where "and there he was working a work" would certainly be more faithful. I am glad to add that the complaint made in my former notice of the absence of all reference to the chapters and verses of the ordinary Bible in the first volume has been attended to in this, and that the passage in the Hebrew or English Bible can now be found without reference to a concordance. I have still to regret that Dr. Williams cannot see the parallelisms and other evidence of poetic rhythm in the prophets, and continues to print them as plain prose. Dr. Noyes, who as a mere translator is nearly equally faithful and besides is a more elegant writer than Dr. Williams, greatly enhanced the value of his work by printing it in rhythmical lines.

2. *Fragmenta Evangelica, quæ ex antiqua recensione versionis Syriacæ Novi Testamenti (Peshito dictæ) a Gul. Curetono vulgata sunt, Græce reddita textuique Syriaco editionis Schaafianæ et Græco Scholzianæ fideliter collata, curante J. R. Crowfoot, S.T.B.* Pars prima. London: Williams and Norgate. 1870.

The title neatly expresses the nature of this work. In it the student finds the text of Cureton's Syriac Gospels

rendered into Greek, and its divergences from the Greek Gospels and from the ordinary Syriac Peshito version carefully noted. The enterprize would hardly have been undertaken by one who did not, as Mr. Crowfoot avows is the case with himself, dissent from Mr. Cureton's belief that his Syriac Matthew presents either the original form of that Gospel, or at least an earlier form of it than the Greek, and gives it in what is essentially its original language, from which the current Greek is a translation. As Mr. Crowfoot thinks otherwise, he is naturally desirous to restore from this Syriac version what may have been the original Greek whence it sprang. It is an obvious remark that to do this at all successfully demands very high qualifications both in Syriac and in Greek scholarship. As far as I can judge, the attempt is very fairly successful; but I cannot see who will be much benefited by it. Few scholars ignorant of Syriac will accept this re-translation as the genuine original Gospel of Matthew; nor will the proposition that the original Gospel was written in Greek, whence it was translated into Mr. Cureton's Syriac MS., find favour with many, since it leaves the origin of the later current Greek version entirely inexplicable. The attempt, however, is meritorious, and it has this great advantage, that by placing Cureton's Gospels and the Greek Gospels side by side in the same language, it greatly facilitates comparison. It is to be hoped that Mr. Crowfoot will be enabled to complete his work.

RUSSELL MARTINEAU.

---

3. *Some Philosophical Books.*

From the appearance of a fifth and much enlarged edition of Mr. Gillespie's Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God,* it would appear that this metaphysical method of seeking theological conviction has a fair number of followers. The line of argument is an extension of that set forth in the last century by Dr. Samuel Clarke. Starting with the fact that the human mind is compelled to conceive of space as infinite, the author infers from this the reality

---

* The Argument à Priori for the Being and the Attributes of the Absolute One. By W. H. Gillespie, F.R.G.S. Fifth Edition. London: Houlston and Sons. 1871.

of a "Being of infinite extension and duration." Then by a series of propositions arranged to look as much as possible like a rigid chain of necessary inference, we are introduced in succession to the Divine attributes; and if the book fulfils the promise which the writer confidently holds out, the patient reader will admit, as he brings to a close his arduous task, that the results of Euclid's reasoning are not more certain and satisfying than is the demonstration here given of the existence and intellectual and moral perfection of the Divine Being. The metaphysical reasoning is ingenious, and the careful study of the book (an earlier edition of which, by the way, was very favourably noticed by Lord Brougham and Sir William Hamilton) cannot fail to be a useful gymnastic exercise for the intellect; but we cannot support its pretensions to be an all-sufficient antidote to atheistic ideas. Demonstrations of spiritual truth, *more geometrico*, whether they come from Spinoza, Clarke, Fichte or Gillespie, seem to us to affect a logical conclusiveness which they do not and cannot possess, and to bring in covertly, under the disguise of definitions and axioms, the very truths which it is their main object to arrive at and to establish. However excellent may be the point of view to which these logical steps may lead us, we still need the insight which spiritual affections give, to discern with satisfying certainty the realities of the unseen world.

The Rev. J. T. Goodsir has written a learned work* on the traces of Divine inspiration and Divine guidance to be found in heathen nations and heathen teachers previous to the birth of Christ. He believes that much which is true and sacred in early Gentile civilization is to be traced back to a primitive revelation made to the as yet undivided human family; and that even after the dispersion, inspiration, while furnished to the Hebrew race in super-eminent modes and degrees, was not altogether denied, though given in a manner less marked and in measure less complete, to the various pagan races. One can scarcely use aught but tones of welcome in reference to a work which aims to extirpate that ugly and pernicious misconception, which would confine God's love and God's inspiration to a single nation

---

* Seven Homilies on Ethnic Inspiration. By Rev. J. T. Goodsir, F.R.S.E. Williams and Norgate. 1871.

and to a single book. Our author will not have his favourite philosophers of antiquity either left out in the cold in this world, or exposed to too fervent heat in the next. Though evidently a sound orthodox believer in the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, he does not seek a monopoly of revelation for Judaism and Christianity, and quotes with manifest gusto Voltaire's sarcastic couplet:

> Vous y grillez, sage et docte Platon,
> Divin Homère, eloquent Ciceron.

We wish he had been able to go a step or two further, and, while recognizing some gems of divine truth among the traditions and superstitions of heathendom, to admit the possibility of some alloy of human error in Jewish literature and in Christian conceptions. Then he would have saved himself and his readers a wearisome waste of words about types and hidden symbolism, and would not have broached such original ideas as that the great Pyramid sets forth on its four faces the geometrical emblem of the triune God, or that the gift of bread by Melchisedek to Abraham was an anticipation of the Eucharist. Natural science is at length allowed to carry on its researches undisturbed by theological denunciation, but the science of Religion has yet to pass through this needful but unpleasant stage in the history of all truth; for even such comparatively liberal divines as Mr. Goodsir shrink from "rationalizing mythologers" like Max Müller, and shudder at "the blind anti-biblical furor" of such scholars as Hitzig.

It has been well said by a recent writer, that the current sensational philosophy is simply the Idealism of Berkeley *minus God*. The good Bishop little thought, when he propounded his famous theory as a panacea for all Atheistic ailments, that it was destined to form the chief ingredient in systems most fatal to all healthy Theistic faith. Mr. Doubleday,* however, does not reject the Divine side of the Berkeleian philosophy, though he throws it quite into the background. His object is to re-state the most salient points in his Master's Idealism, and to strengthen his position by arguments drawn from recent scientific speculations on the Atomic theory and the nature of Force. The view

---

* Matter for Materialists: Letters in Vindication and Extension of Dr. Berkeley's Principles. By Thomas Doubleday. London: Longmans. 1870.

of the material universe which most widely prevails among savants at present, may be said to lie midway between the Materialistic and Idealistic hypotheses, representing nature as external to the mind, yet consisting of a congeries of interacting forces with no material nuclei.

Mr. Doubleday combats this position on the ground that we cannot conceive of force in the abstract; force must be the attribute of something by which it is originated. Considering that Sir John Herschel and others have clearly shewn that the human mind must be allowed to have the power of originating some degree of physical force, it is strange that Mr. Doubleday was not led to regard a volition of the Deity as an adequate substratum for every exertion of energy in nature. Berkeley affirms that the visible and tangible world exists only in the minds of men or of other beings of the same spiritual nature. His disciple does not stop here; but supposes that a realm of being more or less extensive exists in the intelligence of the animal kingdom, and that, possibly, even vegetables are not altogether devoid of consciousness, are immaterial beings having their own world of vague feeling. This attempt to rescue a large portion of geological phenomena from the phantasmal abyss into which Idealism is wont to plunge them, serves perhaps to make more evident the baseless character of the entire theory, and to warn us to put confidence in that irresistible belief in the externality of nature, which every one practically accepts, and which no one can have any means of disproving.

In Mr. Latham's "Theories of Philosophy and Religion,"* we have essays on various forms of Atheistic and Theistic doctrine. The treatment of the subject is very fragmentary, and it is very difficult to gather any self-consistent idea of the author's own views. There is a graphic sketch of the Evolution theory; the procession of a solar system from a gaseous expanse; and we are shewn what impracticable difficulties attend this hypothesis, unless we suppose the concurrent action of Divine intelligence. In lieu of a sketch of Christian Theism we have a new translation with notes of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans made from the

* Theories of Philosophy and Religion compared with the Christian Theory as set forth in St. Paul's Letter to the Romans. By J. H. Latham, M.A. London: Longmans. 1871.

text of the oldest MSS. There is an affectation of literalness pervading the version which often makes it harsh and repulsive, as when Paul is made to term himself "slave of the Anointed Jesus," and sometimes even positively inaccurate, as when the Hebraistic προσωπολημψία is rendered "respect of appearances." C. B. U.

---

4. *Miscellaneous.*

We welcome with much pleasure the re-publication of the very thoughtful and interesting Essays* which Mr. Hutton has contributed during the last few years to the National and other Reviews. His second volume, which is exclusively devoted to literature, may in this place be dismissed with brief mention, although not at all inferior, either in thought or style, to its theological fellow. The reader may not agree with Mr. Hutton's estimate of this or that author; but he will find it impossible not to acknowledge the subtlety of his criticism and the fineness of his insight. Mr. Hutton's judgments are suggestive, even when we hesitate to pronounce them sound; and there is no single essay of the series which does not commend itself as produced by the contact of a living mind with the great intellects which he attempts to characterize. At the same time we earnestly wish that, if it were possible, Mr. Hutton would cultivate a simpler and less figurative style. The metaphors, from which not many successive sentences are free, and the italics, which are to be found on every page, convey a wearying impression of strain after brilliancy and force. Nor, indeed, are the illustrations confined to their subsidiary purpose of illustrating the thought; in many cases they are the thought itself. Our author's mind does not seem to proceed in any line from idea to idea; but rather to be taken violently possession of by one thought, which he proceeds to state and re-state, to illustrate and re-illustrate, by a variety of metaphors which are not always remarkable for beauty of conception and expression, and yet frequently want the homely excellence of running upon four legs. We are constantly deceived into thinking that we are in presence of a new thought; but find, upon stripping off its

---

* Essays, Theological and Literary. By R. H. Hutton, M.A. 2 volumes. London: Strahan. 1871.

gorgeous robe of figure, that it is substantially the same as that upon the last page, and the last page but one. It is possible that Mr. Hutton might lose something of his reputation for subtlety and profundity by chastening and simplifying his style; but we are convinced that his thoughts would be clearer to himself, and his power of moulding the thoughts of others very greatly increased.

With this we have exhausted all our power of finding fault, and turn with pleasure to the more careful consideration of Mr. Hutton's second volume. It is always difficult to give a connected account of a series of detached essays, which have been occasional in their origin, and perhaps have only a subjective unity in the author's own mind. But, in general terms, these essays fall into two main divisions, one of which treats of the fundamental problems of religion from the abstract and philosophical side, while the other and smaller deals with scriptural questions; a bridge between the two being built by the longest and most characteristic paper of the whole series, that on the Incarnation and Principles of Evidence. To the last-named essay, almost alone, is confined the peculiarity of theological view which is supposed to be characteristic of Mr. Hutton and the school of religious thought to which he belongs. We hardly know whether to regret or to rejoice in this. We should have been glad to receive from Mr. Hutton's pen an elaborate and systematic exposition of a theory of Christianity, which, if it command the allegiance of only a disciple here and there, seems to attract none but thoughtful and deeply religious men. But if it had been so, we might have missed the satisfaction of meeting Mr. Hutton, with such entire accord of conviction and feeling, upon the broader level of thought where all spiritual theologians are at home. Here, at the very outposts of faith, in maintaining, on the one hand, the doctrine of a Living Personal God against a theoretical Atheism, and a quasi scientific profession of ignorance of God which is practically only Atheism in disguise,—in defending, on the other, the reality of human knowledge of God against Dean Mansel's theory of an "accommodated" and "regulative" revelation, and the rights of honest and faithful doubt against the "hard-church" brutality of Professor Rogers,—Mr. Hutton has done the noblest service. It is here that his deep sense of

religious realities, his fine spiritual insight, his subtle discrimination between faith and that which only apes its outward seeming, come into active exercise,—qualities of mind and spirit never more urgently needed than now, when physiologists who fancy that they are metaphysicians, and metaphysicians who cannot forget that they are physiologists, imagine that when they have accounted for a few primitive instincts of human nature, they have solved the whole complex problem of God, duty and destiny. It is a prime merit of Mr. Hutton's disquisitions that they keep the reader's mind close to the centre point of all controversy between religion and its opposite. He holds the citadel both against open foes and ignorant and ill-judging friends. And he holds it bravely and well.

The scriptural part of Mr. Hutton's first volume consists of three essays—on M. Renan's "Vie de Jesus," on the same writer's "Paul," and on the historical problems of the fourth Gospel. The first is not much more than an analysis of M. Renan's book, with of course a running commentary of criticism: we refer our readers to the second, as to a very subtle and suggestive study of a character which, more than any other in literary history, seems to invite dissection and description. The contrast between the two essays, we may remark by the way, once more brings into strong relief the ease with which we collect some distinct idea of Paul's personality from the autobiographical materials of his letters, with the difficulty of discerning through the soft haze of evangelical tradition what manner of man was the Master. The paper on the fourth Gospel is a kind of dissertation, in which Mr. Hutton is not nearly so much at home as in studies of character or conflicts of abstract theory. The argument is ingeniously put, and sustained by many striking and subtle observations; there is a kind of persuasiveness in it, of which the reader, when he comes to the end, feels the force; but when he sets himself to review the impression, he finds that he must correct it by the recollection of much that Mr. Hutton has never mentioned, and that the essay has gained impressiveness at the cost of failing to be exhaustive. It will help to confirm the convictions of the already convinced, but we should be surprised if it exercised much independent power of persuasion.

The essay on the Incarnation and Principles of Evidence

was reviewed at length in our pages when it first appeared as one of the "Tracts for Priests and People," and we shall not therefore return to it now. But in connection with it we are tempted to make one remark on a passage of Mr. Hutton's Preface. In acknowledging his obligations to Mr. Maurice, he says, "To him, more than to any other living man, I certainly owe my belief that theology is a true science; that a knowledge of God, in a true scientific sense, however imperfect in degree, is open to us." And believing ourselves that theology is "a true science," and therefore capable of orderly and scientific exposition,—and more, that an important testimony to the validity of any theological conception is its power of harmoniously fitting in to its place in such an exposition,—we earnestly desire that either Mr. Hutton, or some other competent master of the school, would give the world a complete statement of its religious system; or if, as we suspect, the word system revolts against its whole method of thought, would try to shew how its characteristic ideas stand related to other (and not less necessary) religious conceptions. To give a single example of what we mean, has any one a clear idea of the relation in which theologians of Mr. Maurice's school stand to Scripture? That they cling to the Johannine authorship of the fourth Gospel we know, and exalt it to the depreciation of the Synoptics; we owe to them much thoughtful and spiritual interpretation of the Bible; we notice that, in the periodicals which are supposed to represent their opinions, there is always a distinct leaning to conservative theories and interpretations. But we can go no further than this. To the question as to the authority of the Bible, which the religious opinion of our time and country is so earnestly asking, these theologians give no clear reply. So with regard to the peculiar function which they allot to the Second Person of the Trinity (and we call it peculiar advisedly, as being, in our judgment, as inconsistent with ordinary orthodox standards as Unitarianism itself), it is not difficult to apprehend a doctrine so persistently reiterated; but again, when we ask how such a theory is to be made to fall into its place in any complete scheme of Christianity, and what is its relation to other undeniable elements of faith, we get little or no help. It does not assist us to be told that Mr. Maurice is a faithful member of the

Church of England, and accepts the Articles, the Creeds (even the Athanasian) and the Prayer Book, in a sense which is quite satisfactory to his own mind. The fact is an interesting example of the possible pliability of a vigorous and an honest intellect, but hardly a contribution to the scientific knowledge and clearness of thought of bystanders. Mr. Hutton may very well plead that we ought not to look for completeness of exposition in a volume of essays which are avowedly occasional; and we admit, with the utmost frankness, the justice of his plea. But we cannot help thinking that it belongs to the genius of this school of Broad-church thinkers to lay great stress on a few pregnant ideas, and to decline the task of bringing them into mutual order and proportion. Only if it be so, they must be content to look at their form of belief as only a phase of transition, it may be of very temporary duration, towards a clearer and more scientific, if not a deeper and a simpler, faith.

There is much in the form of Mr. Conway's "Earthward Pilgrimage,"* and also in its wealth of allusion and its tone of earnest scepticism, which reminds one of Mr. Carlyle's Sartor Resartus. At all events, we imagine that Mr. Carlyle is a writer with whom Mr. Conway would very willingly be associated, and from whom he has probably drawn a portion of his inspiration. The conception of the book is that of honest revolt against the religious attitude depicted by Bunyan in his Pilgrim's Progress. The author affects to place himself in the position of that celebrated Pilgrim, and describes the weariness that at length came upon him after sitting on a purple cloud with a golden trumpet, and the eagerness with which he sought to exchange the region of idle worship for the so-called City of Destruction with its earnest work. The Interpreter by whom he is accompanied gives an unsparing exposure of Christian doctrine as ordinarily taught in England; and the succeeding chapters are continued in the same key. In the chapter called An Old Shrine, the author takes as his text the inauguration of the Archbishop of Canterbury. He went to the ancient city "to witness the consecration of a plain old Scotch gentleman to

---

* The Earthward Pilgrimage. By Moncure D. Conway. London: John Camden Hotten. 1870.

the task of presiding over the work of maintaining in Great Britain the worship of a dead Jew." "The Thirty-nine Articles shall mean many things, but one thing definitely shall they mean: thirty-nine pieces of money to him who shall betray Reason for them." In a chapter called Contrivance, he criticises as vain and needless the effort made by the Rev. James Martineau and others to preserve to Theism "the great religious heart and history of Christendom." He affirms,

"— that every religious form or rite was once real, every watchword of conservatism was once the watchword of radicalism, all things old were once new. The Litany, idly repeated by happy-hearted youth, who yesterday were at croquet and cricket, was the outburst of stricken hearts amid convulsions of nature, war, plague, and famine: uttered now, it is the mummy of a revival, set up where a real one is impossible. The first silent Quaker meeting was accidental; the emotion of that hour is vainly sought for by the formal imitations of its silence. And so the rantings, shoutings, love-feasts, communions, baptisms, are attempts to recover the ecstasies of shining moments by copying the superficial incidents that attended them,—attempts as absurd as the famous fidelity with which the Chinese manufacturers imitated the tea-set they were required to replace, even to the extent of preserving all the cracks and flaws of the originals."—"That which calls itself conservatism adheres to forms that must become fossil, whereas any true conservatism must rescue the essence by transferring it to forms which have their life yet to live."*

In the chapter on Voltaire, it is rather a one-sided comparison, to say the least, to place him in the same class with "the greatest freethinker who ever trod the earth, whose death-cry was, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' A terrible freethinker's end! Yes, every drop of his blood was paid for free thought!"† In a chapter called The Rejected Stone, commencing with a striking report of theological discussions under the railway arches at St. Pancras, he says:

"What convictions have we corresponding to those which sculptured the Phidian Jove or the Milonian Venus, or painted the great Italian pictures, or built St. Peter's dome? None. Then for the present no real Art. The one thing we really believe in is Scepticism: this is the inspiration of our Science, of our

---

* Pp. 102, 103.

† Pp. 253, 254.

clamour for more education, of our democracy; they are all the utterances of the clear and vigorous Misgiving which distinguishes this age."*

It may comfort some readers to find that the author is not, at all events, an infallible prophet, for in the chapter called the Pilgrim's Last Reflections, he remarks, though his book was published only last year:

"Already it seems doubtful if the West can see another Wellington or another Napoleon I. It requires warlike ages to produce such men; and such ages require peoples capable of being thoroughly drilled and massed."†

We must find room for the following passage from the conclusion:

"There is a story of the Holy Grail which the Laureate has passed by, but which we may remember. In the days when men wandered through the world seeking that cup, made of a single precious stone, holding the real blood of Christ, a Knight left England to search for the same in distant lands. As he passed from his door, a poor sufferer cried to him for help. Absorbed in his grand hope, the Knight heeded him not, but went on. He wandered to the Holy Land, fought in many wars, endured much, but found not the precious cup; and at last, disappointed and dejected, he returned home. As he neared his own house, the same poor sufferer cried to him for help. 'What dost thou require?' asked the Knight. The aged man said, 'Lo, I am perishing with thirst.' The Knight dismounted and hastened to fetch a cup of water. He held the halt-clad sufferer in his arms, raised his head, and proffered the water to his parched lips. Even as he did so the cup sparkled into a gem, and the Knight saw in his hand the Holy Grail, flushed with the true blood of Christ. And you, my brothers, may wander far, and traverse many realms of philosophy and theology, to find the truth which represents the true life-blood of the noblest soul; but you shall find it only when and where you love and serve as he did. If you can but give to the fainting soul at your door a cup of water from the wells of truth, it shall flash back on you the radiance of God."‡

Even from the very fragmentary description of the book which we have been able to give, it will be perceived that it is strong meat for men of full age, rather than milk for babes. There is, we think, a good deal of paradox, arising

---

* Pp. 335, 336. † P. 397. ‡ Pp. 405, 406.

from the violence of the writer's reaction from what he regards as antiquated creeds and superstitions; but the book is full of suggestive thoughts, poetically and pointedly expressed; and though to a thoughtful and judicious reader he may sometimes seem extravagant, one-sided and unfair in his statements and representations, the general impression left by the whole is that it is the earnest and healthy scepticism of a man of real genius. A vigorous mind will be none the worse for the rough handling of many approved maxims and professions of faith. At the same time, there is something to be said in favour of that religious attitude which the author sets out with condemning. However needful and noble a duty it may be in this present world to contend with evil in its various forms of suffering and sin, the very repose and refreshment which we habitually seek among congenial minds in our domestic and social circles, direct our aspirations to a future sphere where suffering and sin will be unknown. We can conceive of work and progress without the necessity of painful strife with evil. Moreover, we cannot help feeling doubtful how far the general realization of the author's views and tone of thought would really tend to the formation of that generous devotion to holy duty which we are accustomed to reverence as the ideal of a Christian character, and which the author himself admires and commends. Certainly it is most strikingly exemplified by many of those whom he regards as held in bondage to superstitious creeds. We cannot help fearing that the ultimate result of the emancipation for which he contends would be an Epicurean, rather than a spiritual, condition of mind. Mr. Conway adopts as the motto of his title-page a maxim from Confucius: "Respect the gods, but keep them at a distance." Surely that soul has attained to a higher and holier region of thought and life, which habitually rejoices to feel, with Jesus, "I am not alone, for my Father is with me."

A careful inquiry into the theology of the New Testament must be valuable to every candid mind, whether it agrees or not with the conclusions arrived at. Such a work is the translation of Dr. Van Oosterzee's Handbook.* Defin-

* The Theology of the New Testament. A Handbook for Students. By the Rev. J. J. Van Oosterzee, D.D. Translated from the Dutch, by Maurice J. Evans, B.A. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

ing his subject as "that part of theological science which presents in a summary form the doctrine of the New Testament concerning God and Divine things, and expresses the same in systematic order," the author considers successively the "Old Testament Basis," "The Theology of Jesus Christ," "The Synoptical Gospels," "The Gospel of John," and deduces as a result, that amid apparent diversity there is harmony, so that the "doctrine of the Lord, communicated by the Evangelist, is, on the one hand, the explanation of the Word of God spoken by Moses and the Prophets; on the other hand, the basis and starting-point of a series of apostolic testimonies in regard to the way of redemption." The theology of the apostles is then examined under the heads "Petrine," "Pauline," and "Johannine," and the volume concludes with an attempt to shew the "higher unity" of all parts of the Bible. To each section are added references to various authors, and "points for inquiry," intended to lead to further discussion of the subject treated of. The position of the author is conservative in regard both to theology and criticism, but he is broader in his views and more scientific in his treatment than some English orthodox writers on these topics. At the same time, it is only too plain that here again, as in most similar undertakings, the student of Scripture has found in the New Testament exactly what his creed prepared him to find there, neither more nor less. The texts to which he refers in foot-notes to substantiate the assertions in the several sections, are frequently so inadequate for the purpose, that one wonders how he could offer them, and is sometimes tempted to suppose there must be a misprint in the references. Thus, to shew that in Paul's writings the doctrine of the Trinity "comes ever afresh into the foreground," we are referred* to 1 Cor. xii. 4—6 and 2 Cor. xiii. 13, passages which do not seem to us to contain the remotest allusion to such a doctrine. Here is an instructive example of the melancholy result of the attempt to deduce a dogmatic system from a process of textual quotation and criticism of writings so diverse in authorship and character as those of the New Testament.

---

* P. 340.

Mr. Bowes's translation of the New Testament* is, we doubt not, a work of honest and conscientious labour, but we cannot say that it is likely to be of much aid to the Revision Committee, or even to supersede the present Authorized Version. It observes the true critical readings, and rejects the spurious passages, but in point of taste and idiomatic English it is a most lamentable change for the worse. We question the desirableness of substituting "glad tidings" for the now familiar word "gospel;" but what reader of the English Bible would endure such changes as the following? "Happy the *mendicants* in spirit, for theirs is the reign of the heavens." "Store up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor *corrosion obliterates.*" "No good tree brings forth *putrid* fruit." "My God, my God, why didst thou *leave me behind?*" Moreover, the sense is not always correctly given. In John xi. 26, for example, a literal adherence to the Greek form of expression conveys a sense in English which the Greek does not mean. It is rendered, "And all the living and believing in me shall *not die for ever.*" The Greek certainly means, as it is rendered in our Common Version, "shall never die." We must add that the appearance of the volume is not very creditable to the translator in his capacity of printer and publisher.

Mr. Jacox has produced, in his "Secular Annotations on Scripture Texts,"† a singularly interesting book. Who he is we do not know: his volume makes its appearance without a word of preface; and whether these papers are the gleanings of a layman's commonplace-book, or part of a minister's notes for preaching, the reader is not informed. The author's method is to take a text or passage from Scripture, and then to string together, with no more of his own matter than is needed to form a connecting link, quotations of similar or related import from authors old and new. The result is pleasanter reading than might be surmised from this inadequate description: the quotations are well chosen, and woven together with much unobtrusive

* The New Testament, translated from the purest Greek. By John Bowes, of Dundee. Dundee: 75, High Street. 1870.

† Secular Annotations on Scripture Texts. By Francis Jacox. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1870.

art. Mr. Jacox does not disdain to cull his flowers even from modern poets and novelists, and wherever he finds a blossom suitable for his purpose plucks it: indeed, we could imagine a scholar, of rigidly severe tastes, finding fault with the book for its comparative deficiency in *ancient* flavour. But that is hardly a drawback to the general reader, to whose attention we heartily commend it.

"The Book of Prayer and Praise"* has been prepared, we believe, by the Rev. Charles Clarke, of the Old Meeting, Birmingham, for the use of his congregation, and published for general adoption. It consists of ten forms for Morning or Evening Worship, and forms for the Communion (comprising suitable hymns), Baptism, Matrimony and Burial, with an appended selection of Anthems and Hymns; so that everything needed for the worshipers is comprised in a single volume. The forms for morning and evening are purposely made short, to allow space for a prayer by the minister suitable to the occasion. One peculiar feature is, that each service recites some of the characteristic sayings of Jesus. The volume evinces judgment, taste, and devout and poetical feeling. Perhaps in some of the prayers there is not so close an adherence to the simplicity of classical English as is desirable for forms of worship that are to bear constant repetition; and the Burial Service contains one prayer too calmly discursive in its character, we think, to be in harmony with the occasion. Perhaps, too, in the selection of hymns, though comprising much that is very beautiful from modern sources, many old favourites may be missed with regret. For ourselves, we appreciate so highly the Book of Common Prayer compiled ten years ago by the Rev. Dr. Sadler, that we should not have felt the want of a new one. The present work bears much less reference to the Church of England model, and the forms are very much shorter. We have no doubt that it is well adapted to the special purpose for which it has been designed.

"Echoes of Holy Thoughts"† is a little book intended as a help to young people who are preparing themselves for a

---

* The Book of Prayer and Praise, for Public and Private Worship, in Fourteen Morning, Evening, and Special Services; with Anthems and Hymns. London: Trübner. Birmingham: Osborne. 1870.

† Echoes of Holy Thoughts, arranged as Private Meditations before a First Communion. London: Whitfield. 1871.

first communion. It is divided into seven chapters, each of which is concluded by a short prayer and an appropriate hymn. While modestly disclaiming all pretensions to originality, it is distinguished by something much better, a spirit of simple devoutness, and a real adaptation to the purposes which it is designed to serve. We have already known it to be used with advantage, and we cordially recommend it to the attention both of parents and ministers of religion.

Mr. John Gill's "Notices of the Jews,"* contains in a small compass a vast amount of research. It consists entirely, as the title indicates, of extracts from ancient writers, often graphic and amusing, though the work, as a whole, will be interesting chiefly, we imagine, to those who are themselves of Jewish descent. It commences with the extremely unflattering representation of the Israelites in Egypt by Schiller in his essay on the Mission of Moses, as a crowded mass of people infected with leprosy, who were naturally objects of disgust and antipathy to their Egyptian masters; and corrects this by an investigation of Schiller's authorities. The volume, however, does not leave the impression of a high estimate of the Jews by outside writers, who have generally regarded them either with puzzled curiosity or with contemptuous ignorance. Perhaps the most amusing extract is a discussion from one of the Symposia of Plutarch, as to the characteristic qualities of swine.

Dr. Stroud's "Treatise on the Physical Cause of the Death of Christ,"† is a republication of a most elaborate and painstaking attempt to prove that the death of Christ was owing to a rupture of the heart from agony of mind, caused by the weight and intensity of his atoning suffering. The book presents a curious compound of medical and anatomical illustration and detail, with the most earnest and devout scriptural investigation and theological reasoning. Both in conception and execution it is most piously orthodox, the literal inspiration and infallibility of the scriptural records

---

* Notices of the Jews by the Classic Writers of Antiquity: being a Collection of Facts and Opinions from the Works of Ancient Heathen Authors previous to A.D. 500. By John Gill, &c. London: Longmans. 1870.

† Treatise on the Physical Cause of the Death of Christ, and its Relation to the Principles and Practice of Christianity. By William Stroud, M.D. Second Edition. With Appendix, containing Letter on the Subject by Sir James Y. Simpson, Bart., M.D. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co. 1871.

being assumed throughout as a basis. We cannot help feeling that the work belongs to a class that already seems obsolete. Looked at even from the writer's point of view, it is a dull book, utterly prosaic, not redeemed by one spark of poetry, imagination or genius. There is, moreover, much repetition and redundancy of argument and illustration. The scriptural argument, also, is by no means unassailable on purely exegetical grounds. But the premisses on which the theological reasoning is founded have been too rudely shaken by the advancing tide of critical and scientific investigation, for such elaborate superstructures to be regarded as anything more than curious and ruined monuments of antiquated research.

We regret that our limits will not allow us to give to Mr. Baldwin Brown's noble volume* such a notice as it deserves. The great questions that lie at the foundation of Theology are here treated of in a thoroughly candid and impartial spirit, while at the same time the convictions of the writer are spoken out manfully. In the former part of the volume, after the tendency to search for truth has been shewn to exist in all ages, there are chapters on "The Infallible Church" and "The Infallible Book." In the latter of these, the real character of the Bible, its true use as contrasted with its frequent injurious abuse, and the right method of gaining spiritual light and life from it, are clearly and powerfully set forth. The means of learning the truth, and God's method of helping us to it, are dwelt on in a chapter entitled "The Doctrine of Christ," in which the absolute necessity of free inquiry and individual conviction is dwelt on. The Spirit of God, it is urged, will lead to a right comprehension of the truth those who honestly seek for it, and what men call unbelief is often the first moving of this divine power within, in protest against incredible dogmas. The last four chapters are instructive sketches of the movements of the quarter of a century that has just closed, in its intellectual, social, ecclesiastical and theological revolutions. There are many passages which tempt us to quote them.

"We theologians have a desperate dread of everything which

---

* First Principles of Ecclesiastical Truth: Essays on the Church and Society. By J. Baldwin Brown, B.A. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

does not come to men in some way from the Bible, or which has not somewhere the imprimatur of the Church. A fact is a text from another book, also of God's writing; it bears the imprimatur of a yet more sacred hand."*

"To know the truth in the Christian sense is to have a certain power in the soul quickened and strengthened to discern it, to hold it, to possess it, in the various forms in which it offers itself to our apprehension. The man who really knows a science is the man who has mastered its methods, and who has therefore the key to unlock every ward which he may wish to enter, and to solve every problem which may successively present itself. This mastery of truth the Spirit affords us by bringing us into spiritual fellowship with a Being who is Truth."†

"Men are increasingly drawn together by that which belongs to the sphere of the sympathies and those beliefs which mould the life; while they attach less and less importance to merely intellectual agreement with regard to the propositions in which they express their judgment about the forms of truth.—It is felt now that there may be a true spiritual oneness—oneness of interior conviction, aim, hope, and work—beneath very diverse intellectual conceptions of the deep things of God; while on the other hand there may be much spiritual separation, and even intense repulsion, between those who repeat the same creed, recognize the same teachers, use the same offices of devotion, and belong by profession to the same Church."‡

These are a few sentences which will serve as samples of the suggestive thoughts to be found in almost every page of a volume which deserves the attentive study of every one who desires to have clear notions of theology and spiritual notions of religion.

In striking contrast to the work just mentioned is that by Dr. Parker,§ with its pedantic title, ungainly style, and most commonplace contents. There is scarcely one of its "advices" which the "young preacher," if possessed of ordinary intelligence, might not anticipate; and the attempts at humour, by which the writer seeks to lighten his lectures, are the dreariest parts of the whole production. The only interesting portions are some hints thrown out as to the relations of pastor and people that prevail in the denomination to which the author belongs, which will sur-

---

* P. 249. † P. 119. ‡ P. 336.

§ Ad Clerum: Advices to a Young Preacher. By Joseph Parker, D.D. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

prise those who are outside of it. The comments on living ministers are in as bad taste as anything can be.

"One Thousand Gems"* may please those readers who want to take their religious reading in homœopathic doses. A letter from Mr. Beecher is prefixed, sanctioning the publication; but it can scarcely be acceptable to him to have his thoughts thus presented piecemeal. A volume of the same size, containing entire sermons, would be more just to the author and more useful to the public. The selection is made with considerable care and judgment; some of the extracts deserve to be called gems; many, however, lose much of their beauty by being taken out of the original setting.

The contrast between the spirit of Christianity, as found in the Scriptures, and the conduct of professed Christians in all ages, is exhibited in a brief popular sketch of the history of Christendom in successive eras, from the first century to the present time.† It is a dangerous undertaking to write history with a dogmatic or didactic purpose. But the liberal temper and practical earnestness of this author save him from being tempted into gross partiality. The errors of the Roman Catholic Church are somewhat severely treated, but those of Protestants are not spared. There is nothing very new or powerful in the volume, but it is evidently well meant, and the strong desire of the writer to see professing Christians true in practice to the spirit of their religion may excuse an excess of effort to push the circulation of his book, which might otherwise expose him to censure. But his appeal to readers to assist in advertising the volume is not likely to be responded to, unless others can find in it much more to instruct and edify than we have found.

We noticed in our last number Dr. Réville's admirable essay on "the Devil,"‡ which originally appeared in the Revue des Deux Mondes, as a review of Roskoff's elaborate work. We have now to record the publication of an En-

---

* One Thousand Gems from the Rev. H. Ward Beecher, compiled by the Rev. G. D. Evans. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

† Christendom, sketched from History in the Light of Holy Scripture. By Charles Girdlestone, M.A. London: Sampson Low, Son, and Marston.

‡ The Devil: his Origin, Greatness and Decadence, from the French of the Rev. Albert Réville, D.D. London: Williams and Norgate. 1871.

glish translation, which is not only well executed, but, if we may judge from the beauty of the typography, has been to its anonymous editor a labour of love. It is at once a good and a dainty book. We may mention, in the same connection, the appearance of a second edition of Mr. R. W. Dale's discourses on the Epistle to the Hebrews, "The Jewish Temple and the Christian Church,"* which we reviewed upon its first publication.

"The Oldest Gospel"† is the title of a little brochure, the author of which, following in the track of Dr. Réville, endeavours to disinter from the Gospel of Matthew those discourses of Christ which, according to Papias (in the celebrated passage preserved by Eusebius), the first evangelist put together. These discourses are translated chiefly from Griesbach's text, their contents and connection being first brought out in a brief analysis. The idea is an admirable one, and the result, as shewing what Christianity was as first taught by Christ, must be a little startling to some teachers of it now. We heartily commend the book to the thoughtful reader.—Dr. Major's "Gospel of St. Mark,"‡ with notes for the use of schools, is quite another kind of thing. Why Dr. Major, who has been Head Master of King's College School, should edit one of the most important of Greek writings on quite different principles to those which he would (we should presume) apply to a tragedy of Euripides, which the world might let die without being much the poorer, we find it difficult to understand. We hardly know what class of students would profit by this needless little book.—Mr. Baldwin Brown's second series of "Misread Passages of Scripture"§ is really a volume of his thoughtful, but somewhat too rhetorical, sermons on *critical* texts. That they are readable and suggestive, we cordially admit; that they remove all the difficulties which they profess to touch, we cannot honestly say. The question which modern thought is asking itself, is not what modified form of orthodox doc-

---

* The Jewish Temple and the Christian Church, &c. By R. W. Dale, M.A. Second Edition, revised. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1871.

† The Oldest Gospel. London: Williams and Norgate. 1870.

‡ The Gospel of St. Mark, in the Original Greek, with English Notes. By J. R. Major, D.D. London: Longmans. 1871.

§ Misread Passages of Scripture. Second Series. By J. Baldwin Brown, B.A. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1871.

trine will satisfy its needs, but whether orthodox doctrine in any form can be suffered to survive. And judged by their relation to this great controversy, Mr. Brown's sermons, interesting and deeply religious as they are, are behind the time.—We must say one word, in conclusion, of a really noble sermon, preached by Dr. Caird at the opening of the new University chapel in Glasgow, and published by desire of the Senate. It is entitled, "What is Religion?" and answers that question, not only in a fine strain of eloquence, but with a deep spiritual apprehension and the largest Christian liberality. Not many such sermons are preached in any church: we are doubly rejoiced to receive this from the famous and venerable communion of which Dr. Caird is a chief ornament.

E.

THE

THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

No. XXXIV.—July, 1871.

I.—THE NERO-SAGA.

Theologische Jahrbücher. Herausgegeben von Dr. E. Zeller. Vols. I. and II. Tübingen. 1842—1852.

The legend of Harold's escape, after the great battle which decided the destiny of England, has recently been cited by Mr. Freeman, in his masterly "History of the Norman Conquest," as an illustration of an ever-recurring tendency of the human mind,—the unwillingness to believe in the death of a true national hero. As long as resistance to the Norman lasted, rumours that Harold was still living and would again appear to lead his countrymen, could hardly fail to multiply within the walls of Exeter and the Camp of Refuge. And when no Harold came, the legend, grounded on the conviction that the hero could not die, gradually grew into form, and men told how the great English king, found half dead by women who came to tend the wounded, was borne off the field and carried to Winchester; how he was there nursed by a gentle Saracen skilled in surgery; how, recovering, he traversed the kindred lands of Saxony and Denmark, seeking relief for England in her sore distress; and how, after many fruitless adventures, he forsook the world, exchanging the high honour of a patriot king for the still higher honour of a saintly penitent.

The same sentiment repeats itself in the legend of the war-chief of the Cambrians. In the twelfth century, the "Breton Hope," the hope of king Arthur's return, supplied the Welsh with a groundwork for national enthusiasm, and afforded great encouragement in their resistance to foreign rule. Various reports, says Thierry, each more fantastic

than the rest, nourished this belief. "Now it was said that pilgrims, on their way from the Holy Land, had met Arthur in Sicily, at the foot of Mount Etna; now that he had appeared in a wood in Lower Brittany, or that the foresters of the king of England, in making their rounds by moonlight, often heard a great noise of horns and met troops of hunters, who said they formed part of the train of king Arthur." Even in the fifteenth century a lingering belief in this patriotic illusion seems still to have survived, according to the translator of the Morte d'Arthur: "Some men yet sayd in many parts of England that king Arthur was not dead, but had by the will of our Lord Jesus in another place. And men say that he shall come again and he shall win the holy cross."

In Germany, the emperor Frederick, surnamed Barbarossa, became the subject of a similar legend. The popular tradition represents him sleeping on an ivory chair in his subterranean hall, awaiting the destined hour when he shall return to the light of day, bringing with him the long hoped-for golden age of Germany. So, too, in the fourteenth century, "the Germans sighed," says a recent historian, "for the time to come when, according to the old legend, Frederic II. should arise from the dead to execute justice, with the aid of his knights, on a corrupt clergy, and restore the church to a new splendour."*

The same faith, the same unwillingness "to believe what a man sees with his own eyes when it stands in contradiction with his wants and wishes," has its embodiment in the patriotic legend of Burgundy. Years after the fall of Charles the Bold, the expectation of his survival prevailed over the evidence of his death. Though his body had been borne in great pomp to Nancy, the people would not believe in the death of a prince whose exploits had so long occupied all minds. "None," says a biographer of the great Duke,† reviewing the expression of popular conviction after the final defeat of his hero,—"none had seen him, none could find him, none had anything to tell. Wild rumours started up. He had ridden into the forest, retired to a hermitage, assumed the religious garb. Goods were bought and sold,

---

* Reichel's "See of Rome in the Middle Ages," p. 433.

† Kirk's "History of Charles the Bold," Vol. III. p. 493.

to be paid for on his appearance, for it was confidently expected that the great Duke of Burgundy would return."

In England, a similar fiction attached itself to the memory of the Duke of Monmouth. "Such was the devotion of the people to their unhappy favourite, that, in the face of the strongest evidence by which the fact of a death was ever verified, many continued to cherish a hope that he was still living, and that he would again appear in arms." Indeed, "the vulgar long continued at every important crisis to whisper that the time was at hand, and that king Monmouth would soon shew himself; and so long did the delusion last, that when George III. had been some time on the English throne, Voltaire thought it necessary gravely to confute the hypothesis that the man in the iron mask was the Duke of Monmouth."*

A popular historian, describing a still more recent delusion, records that years passed over, before the peasants ceased to visit Courtenay's grave, firmly believing that he would come to life again. Nor had his followers only a general confidence in the divine mission of their leader, but were assured that every man should have an estate in land, and should enjoy terrestrial plenty as well as eternal happiness.†

This tendency to disbelieve the unpalatable fact, and to take refuge from the menacing grasp of a hateful reality in some dazzling dream or fascinating impossibility, the daring alternative to an annihilating despair, re-appears in all ages and in all countries. The Aztec race hope for the return of their good deity to the earth which his presence once made a paradise, and long for the restoration of the golden age. Even in our prosaic world, the sceptical poet Béranger did momentary homage to this superstition of the heart, when, mourning over the dead Napoleon, he exclaimed, "Il n'est pas mort; God! I can scarce believe thee without him!"

Of all the legends of presumed disappearance and expected revival, there is none more singular in its origin, more prodigious in its character, or more imposing in its association, than the legend of the matricide son of Agrippina.

Scarcely was the hated but magnificent Nero dead, than

---

* Macaulay, Vol. I. p. 630.

† Knight's History of England, Vol. VIII. pp. 412—417.

the world, to adopt the language of the learned Dr. Maitland, though glad to be rid of him, betrayed a strange anxiety to see him brought back. In Asia, in Achaia, apparently even in Rome, the popular sympathy soon began to find expression. The recollection of the golden Quinquennium, the five years of a comparatively wise and beneficent administration directed by Burrhus and Seneca, was graven indelibly on the minds of the Romans. The populace of Rome, the hybrid herd of the Circus and the Baths, recognized in the extravagant and liberal protection of Nero the terrestrial providence which maintained it and gave it its importance. To humour the populace, an imperial successor was said to have assumed the name of Otho-Nero, and was even suspected of an intention to celebrate the memory of Nero. To strengthen his title with the multitude, Otho erected statues to Poppæa, the deified wife, and proposed to marry Statilia, the respected relict of his predecessor. A similar policy was soon after adopted by Vitellius, who offered sacrifices to the spirit of the fallen emperor on the Field of Mars, with a full assembly of the public priests attending him. The court of Nero supported Otho as the image of their favourite emperor; zealous admirers re-erected the prostrate statues of the prince whom they had lost; even the prætorian guards, always devoted to the Cæsarian family, half regretted the revolt into which they had allowed themselves to be seduced. While at Rome sighs for the luxurious licence of the protector of the low democracy were heard, the inhabitants of the Claudian city of Lugdunum remained loyal to the memory of their imperial patron. Achaia, which, like other provinces, had been presented by Nero with the freedom of the city, can scarcely have been without its contingent of adulatory partizans. In Armenia, Tiridates had laid his diadem before the emperor's image in his lifetime; and Vologesus, the Parthian king under whose protection that pretender had placed himself, was not only an aspirant to the honour of an alliance with Rome, and a devoted admirer of the once gorgeous Nero, but had actually been engaged by him to control the movements of the disaffected Jews in Ctesiphon and Seleucia.

Historical testimony both to the existence of a Neronian party and to the expectation of the return of the late chief of the empire, is supplied by precise and definite statement,

as well as inferred from general representation, in the pages of heathen no less than of Christian writers. We will begin with the greatest of them.

Tacitus, who in Hist. i. 4, describes the servile population of Rome as overwhelmed with grief at Nero's death, and eager to catch at any wild rumour, depicts in Hist. ii. 81, the sensitive and inflammable state of the public mind at the first intimation of Nero's reported survival.

"About the same time (A.D. 69) a report that Nero was still alive and on his way to the East, excited a false alarm through Achaia and Asia. The accounts of his death had been various, which caused the majority to assert that he was alive, and to believe what they asserted.....Numbers were elated to find the name of Nero so popular, hating the existing system and wishing for a revolution. The fame of this pretended Nero gained strength every day, when by a sudden accident the illusion vanished."*

Suetonius, born a few years after Nero's death, confirms the evidence thus furnished by Tacitus.

"There were not wanting those who for a long time decked his grave with spring and summer flowers, and set up on the Rostra, at one time his images dressed in robes, at another time his edicts, as if he were still living and would soon return to the great discomfiture of his foes. Vologesus, king of the Parthians, when proposing to the senate a renewal of friendship, begged earnestly that the memory of Nero might be cherished. Lastly, about twenty years later, during my youth, there was a man of unknown origin who boasted that he was Nero; and so popular was that name among the Parthians, that he was supported with enthusiasm and with difficulty reduced to submission."†

The third witness to the existence of this wild superstition is Dion Chrysostom, who died at Rome about A.D. 117.

"Sporus, who was enraged with Nero, betrayed his intentions to those who were about him. They thus revolted from him, and compelled him to destroy himself in some way or other, for the mode of his death is still an obscure point. There was assuredly no other obstacle to his permanent retention of imperial power, since even at this very day all wish that he was alive, and the majority actually maintain that he is living, though he has undergone many deaths as it were, dying as often as one of their

---

* Oxford Translation Revised, slightly altered.

† Nero, 57, as translated by Dr. Maitland.

number dies, who cherish this firm persuasion of his continued existence."*

From heathen we pass to Christian testimony, and possibly in one instance to Jewish. In the Sibylline Oracles,—that indefensible forgery "which, blinded by their wishes, the Christians hailed as a tribute from Paganism to the truth of their own religion,"†—we have a series of remarkable attestations to the prevailing belief in Nero's continued existence, his flight beyond the Euphrates, his imaginary alliance with the kings of the Medes and Persians, his anticipated return at the head of a mighty army, and his conquest of the city of the Seven Hills.

"He who has 50 for his title or initial (N for Nero = 50) shall be king, a horrible serpent, breathing cruel war, who, stretching forth his hands against his own kin, shall destroy them, and shall struggle and confound all, slaying the people and doing a thousand daring acts. He shall divide the water of the two seas (the Isthmus of Corinth), and shall strike Athos [or] stain it with blood. The destroyer shall then disappear. Afterwards he shall return, making himself equal with God, but God shall shew that he is not equal."‡

"For Hellas, thrice hapless land, shall poets lament, when from Italy the great king of mighty Rome, the godlike man, shall tread the neck of the Isthmus: he who, as they say, is the son of Zeus and the august Here: who, with melodious sound and dulcet songs, courts the popular applause, and, besides a wretched mother, destroys many men. Out of Babylon (Rome) will fly the dreadful and shameless king, whom all mortals, whom all good men, hate. For he has brought destruction on many; he has laid violent hands on the mother's womb; he has done wrong to wedded women; he is made of all that is abominable. To the kings of the Medes and Persians shall he go, for he has desired them before all, and has treasured up glory for them, watching with those evil men, as from a lair, for the ruin of an odious race. Him I mean who has taken the temple divinely built, and has given the men of the city to the flames, even the men that entered (the holy place) and rightly celebrated it in song. At the appearance of that (monster) creation was confounded, kings perished, with all in whom power abode—yea, all who destroyed the great city and the righteous nation. But when a large star

---

* Dion Chrysostom, Or. xxi. ed. Reiske, Vol. I. p. 504.

† Maitland's "School of Prophetic Interpretation," p. 126.

‡ Sib. v. 28—34.

shall shine, and by itself shall destroy the whole earth, to punish men for the honour which in the beginning they offered to Poseidon, the guardian of the sea, it shall fall, the great star shall fall into the mighty ocean, and shall set on fire the deep water, and shall burn even Babylon and the land of Italy, and for her sake many holy and faithful Hebrews, and the true temple too, shall perish."*

"In the end of time and about the limit of the moon shall rage the war of a world gone mad, an insidious and deceitful war, and from the bounds of the earth shall come the man that slew his mother, a fugitive, and nursing bitter thoughts, who will lay waste the whole earth and subdue all that is on it, who is more deep and designing than all men, and who will instantly take possession of her that destroyed him (Rome), and many men and mighty kings will he slay, and he will burn all with fire, as others before him have done."†

"Alas for me, thrice miserable, and for the Latin men above all men! When shall I see that day—thy day, O Rome? Entertain, if thou wilt, the man that with mysterious children comes riding in a Trojan chariot from the land of Asia, bringing with him the heart of one infuriate. When he shall cut through the Isthmus, peering around, and, going everywhere, shall cross the sea, then shall dark blood flow in the track of the great Beast. But the hound follows the lion that kills the shepherds, and they take from him the sceptre, and he passes into the underworld."‡

"O haughty Rome, the first chastisement of heaven shall come down upon thee from on high; thou shalt stoop thy neck and be levelled with the earth; and fire shall consume thee, razed to thy very foundations; and thy wealth shall perish; wolves and foxes shall dwell among thy ruins; and thou shalt be desolate as if thou hadst never been. When thrice five gorgeous Cæsars (the twelve so called, with Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian), who have enslaved the world from east to west, shall arise, there will be a king with a silver helm, with a name like the neighbouring sea (Hadriatic). After him shall reign three whose times shall be the last (the Antonines); one of them (Marcus Aurelius), being an old man, shall long sway the sceptre, a most unhappy prince, who shall hoard up all the wealth of the world in his palace; that, when the fugitive Matricide returns from the ends of the earth, he may lavish it on all and bring great riches into Asia. When the Phœnix shall arrive for the fifth time from Egypt, there shall come one who will destroy the nations and different

---

* Sib. v. 137—161. † Ibid. 361—369. ‡ Ibid. viii. 150—159.

tribes and the Hebrew people. Then shall war prey upon war. *He* shall put an end to the arrogant menace of the Romans. Then shall perish the once flourishing empire of Rome, the ancient queen of surrounding cities. No more will the fertile plain of Rome be victorious, when in the fulness of his strength he shall come out of Asia with his war array. And having accomplished all this, he will afterwards march into the city. But thou shalt complete thrice three hundred and forty-eight courses of the sun, ere thy terrible fate falls with violence on thee, bringing to a close thy very name."*

According to Hilgenfeld, the fourth book of the Sibylline Oracles is undoubtedly of Jewish origin, and contains the earliest explicit vaticination of the Return of Nero in the purely Jewish form of the Saga, i.e. without the death and without the resuscitation. The passage in which it occurs is very remarkable.

"But when through a foolish confidence they shall cast away all care for righteousness and commit horrible murder in the neighbourhood of the temple, then out of Italy shall come a great king, like a star, flying across the river Euphrates, vanishing and leaving no tidings, when he has perpetrated an inexpiable crime, the horrible murder of a mother, and committed other enormities with his wicked hands. Then many shall be slain about the holy ground of Rome, when he flies beyond the boundaries of his native land. But into Syria shall come a war-chief of Rome, who shall kindle fire about the temple and shall slay in war many of the dwellers in Jerusalem, and destroy the great and spacious country of the Jews. And then an earthquake shall destroy Salamis and Paphos, when dark water shall inundate the flooded Cyprus. But when fire shall arise out of the clefts of the earth in the land of Italy, and shall reach to the vast heaven and fall down again, and burn many cities and destroy many men; and fiery ashes shall fill the spacious firmament; and drops, like vermilion, shall fall from the sky,—then shall the wrath of the God of heaven be made known, because they have destroyed the innocent race of righteous men. But to the West shall come the contention of raging war, and the fugitive of Rome shall lift up his mighty spear, and pass the Euphrates with many myriads of men."†

Whether this prediction emanate from the pen of a Jew or of a Christian, we may be at least assured that it is the oldest of the Neronian vaticinations contained in the

---

* Sib. viii. 37, 72, 139—150. † Ibid. iv. 117—139.

Sibylline books, for the chronological juxtaposition of the return of the matricide with the eruption of Vesuvius and the earthquake in Salamis justify, and indeed compel, the inference that the composer must have penned it in or about A.D. 79. In the Eighth Book, as we have seen, the return of Nero and the fall of Rome are fixed for the period A.U.C. 948=A.D. 196. Thus for more than a century the Saga of Nero continued to be repeated in the mystical leaves of the Sibylline muse.

The evidence of the Sibyl is corroborated by a fantastic, but not uninteresting production of the Gnostic school, "The Ascension of Isaiah," which was known to Origen, and was probably written before the middle of the second century.

"Berial shall descend, the mighty angel, the prince of this world, which he has possessed from the creation. He shall descend from the firmament, in the form of a man, an impious monarch, the murderer of his mother, in the form of him, the sovereign of the world. The angel Berial, this king shall come, and with him shall come all the powers of the world, who in everything shall be obedient to his will. At his command the sun shall rise by night, and the moon shall he cause to appear at the sixth hour. Everything which he shall wish to effect in the world shall he bring to pass. He shall address the Beloved, and say, I am God, and before me there was none, no, not any. Then shall the whole world believe on him. They shall sacrifice to him and serve him, saying, 'He is God, and beside him there is no other God.'.....And the power of his prodigies shall be displayed in every city and country. In every city also shall his image be erected."*

To the evidence of the heretical school, we will now add that of the orthodox church. Commodianus, the North-African poet, who, notwithstanding his Patripassian proclivities, is allowed by Neander to have written his *Instructions* in the consciousness of belonging to the Catholic community, wrote about the middle of the third century, or perhaps a little before; for in one of his poetical compositions he computes the interval between his own time and that of Christ at two hundred years.

"Hear what the prophet says of the man who moves alike

* Ascensio Isaiæ Vatis a Ricardo Lawrence, pp. 108, 109.

the earth and its kings. The world shall end when he shall appear. Nero shall be released from the shades below. The earth shall tremble for seven years. Helius shall have the half, Nero shall have the half, time. Then shall Babylon be consumed to ashes. Thence shall he go to Jerusalem, and a Latin conqueror shall declare, 'I am Christ, whom ye ever adore.' And many shall be deceived and shall praise him, for his false prophet shall do many signs, and the image shall speak that they may believe him. The trumpet shall sound from heaven, and the lion (Nero) shall be destroyed. The Almighty shall inflame the nations, and the Medes and Parthians shall rage for a thousand years, as says John in his Revelation; and after a thousand years they shall be delivered to hell. The heavenly people shall hasten to defend their captive mother (Jerusalem). But the wicked king who holds her in his power shall hear it and fly into the north and gather his followers together. And when the tyrant engages with the army of God, the soldiers, struck with celestial terror, shall fall prostrate before him. And he, with the abominable false prophet, shall be taken, and by the decree of the Lord shall be cast alive into hell."*

Victorinus Martyr, the Bishop of Pettaw, in Austria, has left an instructive commentary on the Apocalypse, much injured, as Dr. Maitland remarks, by the attempts of the copyists to remove from so important a work the traces which it bore of the primitive Millenarian belief. One clause, however, has escaped their vigilance, and the old doctrine still appears in the Chiliastic assertion that Judæa is the place where all the saints will assemble and worship their Lord. The interpretation of the Apocalypse, or of that part of it in which we are now interested, supported by Victorinus, is equally consonant with the old eschatological faith, as affirmed in the Sibylline Oracles, and reiterated in the "Instructions" of Commodianus. Victorinus, who died A.D. 303, explains the seven-hilled city of the Apocalypse to be imperial Rome; and asserts that the seven heads of the mystical Beast are seven Roman emperors, one of whom is Antichrist.

There are, he tells us, five kings who have fallen; and

---

* See Commodianus, xli. xlii. xliii.; Migne's Patrologiæ Cursus Completus, Vol. V. The text seems obscure, and is sometimes corrupt. I have given the sense of the various passages relating to Nero, not indicating the breaks, and omitting some lines.

there is one who still flourishes, namely, the king under whom the Apocalypse was written. The Beast, he says in another place, is Nero; and, again, Nero is the head that was wounded as it were to death, and whose deadly wound was healed; and in proof of the correctness of the interpretation he adds, "for it is well known that when the troop of horse sent by the Senate was in pursuit of Nero, he cut open his throat with his own hands." God then, he continues, sends this man, whom he has brought to life again, as a king, but such a king as the Jews deserve; and Jews, and even Christians, shall call him Christ. He will rise again from the abode of the dead, and will be permitted to return with an extraordinary name and with an extraordinary performance. The Apocalyptic miracles of calling down fire from heaven, &c., will, Victorinus assures us, be wrought by magicians assisted by apostate angels. The false prophet, he concludes, will cause a golden image to be set up in the temple of Jerusalem, and into this image the vagabond angel will enter, emitting voices and oracles. When he (Nero or Antichrist) shall be returned from the East, he shall be sent from the city of Rome with his armies.*

Our next witness is the author of the treatise, "On the Deaths of Persecutors," written a few years after the Diocletian persecution. Quoting the authority of the Sibyl, this writer prophesies that the Roman name will be taken from the earth and that the empire will revert to Asia. Nero he depicts as a deposed, helpless tyrant; as an evil beast, whose disappearance was so complete, that even his place of burial could not be found. On this account he continues:

"Certain crazy persons fancy that he is translated to another place, is alive and reserved, as the Sibyl says that the fugitive matricide will return from the ends of the earth; that as he was the first, so he may be the last persecutor; and they believe, which is very wrong, that he will precede the coming of Antichrist, declaring, that as two prophets were translated, while still living, to announce at the world's end the holy and eternal advent of Christ, when he shall begin to descend, accompanied by his saints, so Nero will come, in the same way, as the herald

---

* Vic. in Apoc. cap. xii. xvii.

and precursor of the devil, when he appears to lay waste the earth and destroy the human race."*

The existence of the same chimerical belief is affirmed by Sulpicius Severus, whose birth is usually referred to the year 363. In the twenty-ninth chapter of his "Sacred History," he resumes his account of "the vilest of cruel beasts, the matricide and intending destroyer of the Christian Church, and, in the opinion of many, the predicted Antichrist."

"In the meanwhile Nero, who from the consciousness of his guilt had grown hateful even in his own eyes, departed this mortal life, but whether slain by his own hands or not is uncertain. Assuredly his body received a deadly wound, and accordingly people believe that, although he ran himself through with his own sword, his wound is healed, and he is reserved, as it is written of him—'And his deadly wound was healed'—that he may be sent at the end of the world to give effect to the mystery of iniquity."

Augustine, Bishop of Hippo (A.D. 420), agrees with Lactantius in his estimate of this once orthodox and still existing belief in the return of Nero. By the mystery of iniquity, he admits, some, even in his own time, understood the wicked emperor of Rome, whose conduct had a plausible resemblance to that which was to mark the career of the future Antichrist. Accordingly, he continues:

"Some surmise that he will rise again in person and be himself the Antichrist. Others are of opinion that he was never killed, but only withdrawn, that he might be supposed to be killed, and that he is still living, and in a place of concealment, in the full vigour of the time of life to which he had attained at the period of his supposed death, awaiting his hour to be revealed and restored to sovereign power."†

In these numerous citations we have evidence of the long continued transmission of the Nero-Saga, and of its survival, though growing unpopularity, from the last quarter of the first to the middle of the fifth century. The

---

* Lactantii de Mortibus Persecutorum, cap. xi. This treatise has, however, been attributed to some unknown Cæcilius, quite different from L. Cæcilius or Cælius Lactantius. The question is no way affected by it, as the probable date of authorship is A.D. 312—315.

† Augustine de Civitate Dei, lib. xx. cap. xix.

legend, as Augustine intimates, had two forms. According to one version, Nero had never died, but was still reserved in some secret place, that at the proper time he might assume the attributes and functions of the dreaded Antichrist. According to another, Nero had certainly been slain, but was destined to rise from the dead and re-appear in that portentous character. By Sulpicius Severus a distinct reference is made to the deadly wound with the sword which was healed; and the appeal to scriptural authority leaves no doubt that the passage to which he referred was Rev. xiii. 3, 14.

That the expectation of Nero's revival and return as Antichrist was not only a prevalent belief in the early Christian community, but was also the belief of the author of the Apocalypse,—a belief that shaped and coloured the action of his drama of the Latter Days, is a theory which can be supported by weighty and, in our opinion, convincing arguments. This conclusion was long ago adopted by Dr. Neander, the learned reviver of evangelical faith in Germany; and, in the hope that his authority may win a hearing for an uninviting hypothesis, we shall cite from the "History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church," a decisive declaration of opinion as to the inclusion of the Nero-Saga in the mystical pages of the Apocalypse:

"We remark in this book the rival impression which Nero's persecution of Christianity, his setting on fire part of the city of Rome, and especially his cruelties, had made on the minds of men. The story that Nero was not really dead, but had retired to Euphrates and would return again from thence, appears here more fully delineated by a Christian imagination. He is the monster to whom Satan gave all his power, who returns as Antichrist and the destroyer of Rome, who will force all to worship his image. The Roman empire at that time is set forth as the representative of heathenism and of ungodly power personified; and in this connection, under the image of the Beast with seven heads, the seven Roman emperors which would succeed one another till the appearance of Antichrist, Nero is signified as one of these heads, xiii. 3, which appeared dead, but whose deadly wound was healed, so that to universal astonishment he appeared alive again. Nero re-appearing, after it was believed that he was dead, is the Beast which was and is not, and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit, and yet is, Rev. xxii. 8. Of the seven

emperors who were to reign until the appearance of Antichrist, it is said that five have fallen, one, Nero's successor, is now reigning, and the other is not yet come, and when he comes he must remain only a short time; and the Beast which was and is not is itself the eighth and one of the seven. Nero, as one of the seven emperors, is the fifth, but inasmuch as he comes again as Antichrist, and founds the last universal monarchy following the succession of the seven emperors, he is the eighth. Nero comes from the East, supported by his tributaries, the ten kings, his satraps, the ten horns of the Beast, leagued with him to destroy Rome and make war with him on Christianity. The waters of the Euphrates are dried up to make a way for Nero and his ten satraps, xiv. 12, who in his service would burn and destroy Rome, xvii. 16. All this marks the time at which the Apocalypse must have been written, the change of the empire after Nero, while the image of this monster was yet in vivid recollection, and men were disposed to depict the future in magnified images of the past. It also agrees with this date that the temple at Jerusalem is described as still in existence, before A.D. 70."

Leaving Neander's general survey of the Apocalyptic mysteries to make its due impression, we will seek in the ideal elements of the prophetic vision their external corresponding realities, and thus shew that the hypothesis which we advocate furnishes a satisfactory solution to the obscurities of the enigmatical description.

The doomed city of the Apocalypse is symbolically named Babylon. Now, in the oldest Christian literature, by the Sibyl, by Tertullian, by Hippolytus, by Chrysostom, Babylon is acknowledged to be a figure of imperial Rome. In the Apocalypse, the mystical woman is depicted as sitting on seven mountains. So, in Pagan and in Christian literature, Rome received the distinctive appellation of the City of the Seven Hills. The patriotic Horace, the Christian Prudentius, the inspired Sibyl, all identify Rome as the City of the Seven Hills.* The seven heads of the Beast on which the woman is seated are explained to be seven kings. Beginning with the founder of the universal monarchy, we easily complete the required catalogue. 1, Augustus. 2, Tiberius. 3, Caligula. 4, Claudius. 5, Nero. Nero was the fifth of the five fallen kings; Galba, the sixth in the

---

* Carmen Sæculare, v. 7; Prud. Steph., x. 412; Sibyl, B. ii. 18. The seven hills are Cœlius, Esquilinus, Viminalis, Quirinalis, Capitolinus, Palatinus, Aventinus.

prophetic list, was the reigning monarch, at the time when the Apocalypse was written, between June 68 and January 69. The seventh emperor, as "not yet come," remains an irrecognizable personality. The brief interval of power allotted him would be terminated by the accession of a king who stands eighth in his list of potentates, but is identified with one of the previous seven. He is the Beast which had the wound by a sword and did live; for as the actual depositary of supreme power, the afflicted head is made to represent, and in a certain sense to be, the mystical sea-animal, which, as a revision of the monster in Daniel's elder revelation, is a symbol of the cruel and idolatrous world-empire of Rome. We need only turn to the pages of Suetonius to discover the application in this description to Nero. Assisted by his slave Epaphroditus, Nero drove a sword into his throat, and not long after died, with glazed and protruding eyes, to the horror and dismay of all that saw him. The author of the Apocalypse was perfectly satisfied of the death of Nero. Accordingly he represents him as dead, as a tenant of the under-world, and as resuscitated, or healed of his deadly wound, thus sanctioning the extraordinary belief of the early Christian enthusiasts in Nero's return.

But who, it will be asked, are the ten horns or kings which have as yet received no kingdom? The symbolism here is suggested by that of Daniel vii. 24, where the ten horns are explained to be the ten kings that shall arise on the dissolution of Alexander's empire. The ten kings of the Apocalypse are not, as Neander supposes, the kings of the East, of whom we shall speak presently, but the future kings of the subject provinces of Rome; for it must be allowed that the ten horns, like the seven heads, are attributes of the Beast or tyrannical empire. After the death of Nero, who left no recognized successor, a general dissolution menaced the empire. There was no legitimate source of sovereign power; the proconsuls knew not whom to obey; the army was in open revolt. Julius Vindex had already conspired; the soldiers of Virginius had offered to raise him to the purple. In Africa, Claudius Macer—in Germany, Fonteius Capito, had proclaimed themselves candidates for the sovereignty. In Gaul and in Spain there were also pretenders to empire. Even the commander of the prætorian guards,

Nymphidius Sabinus, attempted to usurp the vacant throne; while Galba, Otho, Vitellius and Vespasian, contested and occupied it in rapid succession. It was precisely this period of convulsion, not perhaps in its precise details, but in its general characteristics, which passed before the prophetic field of view in the Apocalypse, and the recognition of the prevailing anarchy and rebellion against the imperial city is one of the most decisive indications of the date of the composition. As regards the number ten, it is not necessary to shew that there were precisely ten aspirants to power. Possibly the proconsuls of ten leading provinces might hover before the vision of the prophetic enumerator; but, as Professor Zeller remarks, had official documents computed the presiding magistrates at more than ten, the requirements of an ideal arithmetic to equalize them with the ten kingdoms of the archetypal prediction in Daniel, would have necessitated their reduction to the orthodox Apocalyptic number.

From these kings expectant, who are called (xvi. 14, xix. 19) kings of the whole world, that is, of the Roman empire, we pass now to the kings of the East, the kings who come from the rising of the sun, and before whom the great river Euphrates is said to be dried up. The leaders of the innumerable army of horsemen whom (ix. 14) the release of the four angels, which were kept bound by its waters, sped on their terrible way, are undoubtedly these identical kings. The river Euphrates was the old boundary of the Jewish kingdom and the present boundary of the Roman empire; it was also the recognized advancing and retiring line of Parthian and Roman. The region of the Euphrates, again, is recognized as the retreat of the false Neros; it was the river Euphrates which the matricide king of the Sibyl crossed when he fled from Italy; it was thence (Dion. lxiii. 1) that the magnificent procession departed which accompanied the sons of Vologesus, Pacorus and Monobazus, on their way to Rome, when the Armenian king returned to the Capitol to receive the diadem from Nero; it was to the Parthians that Nero contemplated flight; it was a Parthian king who had invited Nero to his dominions, and who, after Nero's death, entreated that his memory might be honoured; it was among the Parthians that Nero's name was cherished; and it was with myriads of Parthian soldiers that he was to re-

turn to destroy Rome and exact a dreadful retribution from his enemies.* We cannot doubt, then, that the kings of the East are the Parthian allies of Nero, and we may add that in the Book of Enoch the military leaders of Parthia bear the same, or nearly the same, designation.

The office assigned to the allies of the Beast in the Apocalypse is to desolate and destroy Babylon, that is, Rome; and the civil war which was carried to the very gates of the city shews how little force lies in the objection, that the provincial chiefs of the empire were little likely to be selected by the author of the Apocalypse as the agents of that destruction. The fate predicted for Rome fell on many districts of Italy. "The soldiers of Otho, it was said, exhausted Italy; but it was desolated by the ruffians of Vitellius."† The object of the chief citizens was to save Rome from the licence of the plundering legions on the approach of Primus; and the assault, defence and conflagration of the Capitol, followed by the storm of the city and combat in the streets, prove that in the contest for power no patriotic considerations would have averted the fate of the imperial capital. The dark catalogue of evils with which Nero on his downfall threatened the world, makes the historic record of Suetonius a counterpart of the prophetic picture of the author of the Apocalypse:

"At the first breaking out of these troubles, it is believed he had formed many cruel projects, but agreeable enough to his temper—to give out new commissions for the government of the provinces and command of the armies, and to send assassins to butcher all the former governors and commanders, as all unanimously engaged in a conspiracy against him; to massacre all the exiles and all the Gauls in Rome, the former lest they should join the revolters, the latter as privy to the designs of their countrymen and favourers of them; to deliver up Gaul to be wasted and plundered by his armies; to poison the whole senate at a feast; to fire the city, and then let out the wild beasts upon the people, to divert them from stopping the progress of the flames."‡

But we must now direct our attention to a second symbolical Beast, described as coming up out of the earth, doing

---

* Vologesus actually offered Vespasian 40,000 horsemen for his campaign.

† Merivale's History of the Romans, Vol. VII. p. 135.

‡ C. Suet. Tranq. Nero Claudius Cæsar, 43.

great wonders, and giving life to the image of the Beast. In another passage this Earth-beast appears in the character of the false prophet and miracle-working agent of the wounded head. As Antichrist is the counterpart of the Messiah, and as the Messiah has his precursor in Elias, so must Antichrist have a prophet for a precursor. In an interpolated passage in the third book of the Sibylline Oracles, the power of performing prodigies is attributed to Belial, who is to emanate from the imperial family, there called Sebastini or Augustani. As in the Ascension of Isaiah, so in these verses, Nero is the predicted Berial or Belial. In the Apocalypse, as in these apocryphal writings, these illusory miracles are said to deceive many. Like Simon Magus in the Clementine Homilies (Hom. iv. 4), the false prophet gives motion or life to an image. Nero "adopted his superstitions as well as his garb and habits from Syria, from the Parthian or Armenian priests, or from the diviners and necromancers of the credulous East."* To the art of magic, the art of compelling the gods to his will, says Pliny, "he devoted wealth, energy, natural abilities—in short, all his resources." An astrologer re-assured the emperor when the comet struck terror into his abject mind. Another astrologer promised him the dominion of the East, and even specified the kingdom of Jerusalem. The idea of the false prophet, then, was suggested by the retinue of Oriental theurgists, who administered to the diseased imagination of Nero, and possibly also by the sacerdotal corporations that presided over the religious services of the deified emperors. As the two witnesses of the Messiah are ideal beings, or actual revivals of Moses and Elias, so the Beast from the earth, in his individual capacity, may have been conceived as a man endowed with a portentous personal ascendency, like the mythical Simon Magus or the prophet Balaam.

The adoration of the Beast furnishes us with another identifying mark. A peculiar form of idolatry had been formally established by Augustus. "The nations proclaimed him a deity, and he had seemed to himself to grow up to the false proportions ascribed to him." Eleven cities of Asia contended for the honour of making Tiberius their tutelar divinity. Caligula claimed divine worship, intruded his

---

* Merivale's History of the Romans, Vol. VII. p. 6.

statues into Jewish synagogues, and ordered a colossal figure of himself to be erected in the temple of Jerusalem. The Roman world willingly ascribed divinity to the lords of the human race. The emperors were worshipped in the provinces during life, and formally deified after death. Nero himself dedicated a temple to Claudius; his wife Poppæa received divine honours after her death; his daughter Augusta, who died four months after her birth, was proclaimed a goddess, and provided with the couch, the temple and the priest, as the necessary appanage of her deity. Nero, if he did not himself demand adoration during his lifetime, as Caligula had done before and Domitian did after him, was not without his obsequious admirers.* Tiridates, we are assured by Dion, accompanied by his Parthian attendants, fell on his knees before Nero, declaring that he came to him as to his God, to worship him as he worshipped Mithras. His retinue is said to have joined in this act of prostration. At Rome, the citizens hailed him with the titles of Nero Apollo and Nero Hercules, "invoking his *divine* voice, and pronouncing all who heard it blessed." Gold and silver medals, an imperial coinage, represented the head of Nero encircled with rays, which, though possibly meant only to indicate his rivalry with the Sun-god, were the customary emblem of divinity. On the suppression of Piso's conspiracy, Cerialis Anicius moved that a temple with all possible speed should be erected at the charge of the state to the deified Nero, a motion by which he intended to intimate that he had outtopped the pinnacle of mortal greatness and deserved the worship given to the gods.† By Dion Chrysostom,‡ the temple of Æsculapius in Pergamum is said to have belonged to Nero, but by what title or in what sense does not appear; the Sibyl, prophesying in the second, if not the first century, declares that Nero made himself equal to God; and the eloquent preacher, who bore, like Dion,

---

* See Merivale's remarks, Vol. VII. p. 3 of his *History of the Romans.* In another passage of the same work he remarks, "Nero, emboldened by the incredible submission of the world to his feeble sceptre, treated gods and men alike as mere slaves of his will, ordained equally, whether on earth or heaven, for his personal service and gratification." Compare 2 Thessalonians ii. 4. See also the tragedy of *Octavia*, generally ascribed to Seneca, but probably written by Curiatius Maternus in the reign of Domitian, for Nero's contempt of religion.

† Tacit. Annal. lib. xv. 74. ‡ D. C. Orat. xxxi.

the appellation of the Golden Mouth, affirms in his commentary on 2 Thessalonians that Nero desired to be considered as a God. In the Apocalypse, the idolatrous adulation of which the dead Cæsars were the object, is described as exalted to its highest pitch, and tendered to the resuscitated and superhuman Nero, in his character of Antichrist, the mock counterpart of "the risen Jesus."

We come now to the Mark of the Beast, that mysterious badge which conferred on its possessor authority to buy and sell. By this mark is meant, as we conceive, the *Civitas Romana*, or that form of it known as the *Jus Latii*. The *civis* possessed the complete rights of a Roman citizen; the *Latinus* had a *commercium*, or right of acquiring ownership of a particular kind, and a capacity for all acts incident to that ownership, as well as for testamentary disposition and inheritance of property under will. The Latin franchise had been extended by Julius Cæsar to provincials; the Jus Latii had been conceded to all the Transpadani about B.C. 89. This new Latinitas, as it was called, was subsequently extended to whole towns and countries. Nero himself conferred on the nations of the maritime Alps the privileges of Latium, proclaimed the freedom and immunity of all Greece, and awarded the honour of Roman citizenship to the judges who pronounced him victorious, when, contending in tragedy and comedy at the Isthmus of Corinth, "he crowned the people of Rome and the world which was his own."

Still more important, as an identifying mark, is the Name of the Beast, variously described as the number of his name, the number of the Beast, the number of a man. The collective Beast, be it observed, is represented by each of his heads in succession, and in the case of the wounded head the identity is distinctly indicated, since what is said of the Head (xiii. 3) is said of the Beast also, xvii. 2. The name of the Beast is the numerical value of the name, and it is declared, with suggestive emphasis, that the number of the Beast is the number of a man. This, indeed, is sometimes explained as a Hebraism, and understood to mean, "easily comprehended;" but, not to object that there is little point in such an intimation, the true meaning of the phrase is placed beyond all doubt by a similar expression, xx. 17, where the measure of the angel is said to be the measure of

a man. Now in order to satisfy the requirements of our hypothesis, that the fifth emperor of Rome is the Antichrist of the Apocalypse, the letters composing the name of Nero ought to make up the number specified in the text, 666.

In 1866-7, Hitzig, then of Zürich, and Benary of Berlin, mutually controverted the claim preferred by each to the prior discovery of this symbolical name. A third candidate soon appeared in Professor Reuss, of Strasburg, who affirmed that as far back as 1835 he had solved the enigma. Dr. Reuss, in his turn, was superseded by Professor Fritzsche at Rostock, who as early as 1831 had published his discovery in an obscure theological review. The nearly simultaneous and perfectly independent solution of the problem by four learned theologians, in precisely the same way, is in itself a presumption of the correctness of the discovery.

The answer which, according to their united verdict, satisfies the conditions of the Apocalyptic riddle, consists of the words Nero Cæsar. Writing in Greek, the discoverer of this open secret adopted the recognized Greek equivalents of the Latin appellative of the wicked Roman emperor. Professing to reveal only to the initiated the number of the man, the name of the mystical Beast, and carefully disguising it from the profane gaze of the vindictive and dangerous vulgar, he had recourse to the ingenious device of substituting for these Greek equivalents the corresponding symbols of his own consecrated alphabet. Expressed in Hebrew characters, the double name of the ambiguous king of the Apocalypse would be written נרון קסר: for as in the Hebrew language some of the vowel sounds only were distinguished in writing, and that, not by appropriate signs, but by certain consonants, the Greek vowels are not here represented; the ו, though denoting the long *o* in Νέρων, being properly a consonant with the sound of the old German *w* or the Latin *v*. The numerical value of each of these Hebrew letters and of the sum-total of all of them, conformably to the well-known practice of employing alphabetical characters for numerals, is here subjoined:

נ	=	50	ק	=	100
ר	=	200	ס	=	60
ו	=	6	ר	=	200
נ	=	50			
		306	+		360 = 666

The solution, startling in its precision and simplicity, almost extorts our assent. The inherent probability of its correctness is powerfully and unexpectedly reinforced by the argument derived from an alternative enumeration recorded by an ancient Father of the Church. Irenæus* shews that there were two readings of the numerical name in the MSS. extant in his time,—666, the authentic reading, as he firmly believed, and 616, which he pronounced an accidental interpolation. The true explanation unquestionably lies in the fact, that the old Western or Latin copyists were acquainted with the proposed solution. By the Romans, *Nero* was spelt without a final *n*, the indispensable addition to the Greek form of the name. The numerical value of N=50, subtracted from the 666 of the original text, leaves exactly 616, the reading of the more recent, and probably western, manuscripts of the Apocalypse. An objection to the solution, grounded on the employment of Hebrew where the use of Greek characters might have been expected, is obviated by the consideration that the author had a motive for concealment; that he fairly warns his readers that the proposed enigma would tax their mental ingenuity; and that, the Christians of the first century consisting largely of Jews, a reference to the Hebrew alphabet, in the case of a Jewish writer, was not beyond their ordinary powers of conjecture. Equally nugatory is the objection based on the alleged violation of orthography, as may be seen in a note in which Professor Zeller discusses the question in the first volume of the *Theological Annual*. Dr. Réville, in his *Essais de Critique Religieuse*, refers to Buxtorf's *Lexicon*, p. 2081 and the Syriac version of the New Testament, for additional support.

Such is the Saga of Nero. The question of its origin remains to be discussed. The Saga is first circulated in Achaia and Asia. As far back as A.D. 63, Nero had contemplated visiting the East in person. Suetonius not only intimates that Nero was expected to return from his mysterious retreat, but that astrologers had predicted that Nero, when deserted by all the world, would attain to the empire of the East; and some of them expressly promised him the kingdom of Jerusalem.† To apply to the Parthians for

* Adv. Hær. v. 30.

† Nero, cap. xl.

protection was, according to the same historian, a contingent expedient with Nero, when he trembled before the approach of Galba. The three false Neros—the slave who raised a sedition in Pontus, the man whose real name was Terentius Maximus, and the pretender who appeared twenty years after Nero's death—were all connected with the East. It was in the East, moreover, that the old and constant belief was current, that men issuing from Judæa should be the masters of the world; and the testimony of Tacitus and Josephus demonstrates how great an interest Messianic ideas had for the Roman world. The evidence adduced from the classical historians evinces that the expectation of Nero's return was prevalent within a few months after the death of the emperor. The predisposition to accept any rumour sufficiently in unison with popular sentiment,—the sentiment of sorrowful and longing regret for the brilliant Neronian past, and of profound dissatisfaction with the existing regime,—an eager, excited mind and a wild, credulous hope,—were conditions to the formation of the myth undoubtedly furnished by the Roman world. Other elements were supplied by Nero himself. He had, Tacitus tells us, mysterious designs about the East: Egypt, he fancied, even in his fall, might possibly afford him a dignified retirement. In his personal character, an eccentric and fantastic turn of mind, a lust after the incredible, a thirst for boundless admiration, a contempt for all law, human and divine, carried so far as to plunder the temples of the gods and expel their legitimate occupants, were traits favourable to the circulation or even completer formation of the Saga. The fact, too, that only a few persons had been present at Nero's death, encouraged the fiction that he had never really died.

But the Roman world, though it might re-act on the original nucleus of the myth, was not likely to originate it. The opinion of Baur and Zeller, that it is of Eastern derivation, is, on the whole, more probable. The legend has a Judæo-Christian stamp about it. The alleged promise to Nero of the empire of the East—nay, more, of the kingdom of Jerusalem, points to an Oriental, that is, a Christian source. The Christians alone appear to have had an adequate motive for the creation of so singular a legend.

Scarcely had the conflagration at Rome terrified the world with its lurid light, than, to divert popular odium and sus-

picion from himself, the emperor resolved to sacrifice the "band of alien sectaries, already the objects of their hatred and rivalry, to whom the vulgar gave the name of Christians." Wrapt in skins and worried by dogs, crucified or blazing, as beacons across the night, "a great multitude" of the disciples of Jesus were destroyed to satiate the ferocity of a single tyrant. For this tragic occasion Nero lent his own gardens, and, dressed as a charioteer, was present at the race with which he insulted the agonizing martyrs. Was it wonderful that this appalling sacrifice, which has impressed so deeply sixty generations of Christians, should have appeared the characteristic work of Antichrist? Nero was the first persecutor of the Christian Church. This was an adequate motive for the identification of Nero with Antichrist. Assuming the existence of an Antichrist, that Antichrist must be Nero. The matricide, the murderer of his brother, of his friends, of his wives, the desecrator of religion, the man whose armies were menacing the holy city and the temple itself, the ferocious persecutor of the Church, the destroyer of Rome by fire, could not but seem to the inflamed imagination of the eschatological enthusiasts of the first century pre-eminently fitted to play the part of the predicted Antichrist. Nor would the revival of the dead Cæsar in some mysterious form present any difficulty to the elastic faith of the early Christian Church. Jewish story loved to tell of the return of Moses, Elias, Enoch or Jeremiah; and the evangelical narrative assures us that among the popular speculations on Jesus, a favourite one was that he was John the Baptist risen from the dead.

The solution of the enigma of the Apocalypse which we are advocating is in curious harmony with the analogous imagery of another canonical book, the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians. The man of sin and son of destruction, the mystery of iniquity, the powers and signs and successful imposture, the flaming fire and the interposed delay, reflect the corresponding latter-day phenomena of the seer of Patmos, not ideas peculiar to the circle of Jewish eschatology. The expression, "mystery of iniquity," is directly applied by St. Chrysostom to Nero, "who was," he says, "a type of Antichrist, for he wished to be reckoned a god." The caution against spurious authorship in the Epistle has a singular correspondence with the warning in

the Apocalypse. The relevancy of such a caution is difficult to understand, if, as is generally believed, 2 Thessalonians was written at the commencement of Paul's literary career. The remarkable clause in 1 Thessalonians, "the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost," points to the investment of the doomed city by the armies of Vespasian; and so unquestionable did the reference seem to Ritschl, that he arbitrarily rejected the clause as an interpolation, in order to avoid the admission of a later date.

However this may be, the advent of Antichrist is, both in Thessalonians and the Apocalypse, regarded as the antecedent of the appearance of Christ, and the consummation of time or the end of the world. It was a tenet of the Stoic philosophy that the whole world would finally be consumed; that with the evaporation of the water, earth and air would cease to exist; and that out of the residuary element, fire, as out of an animating power and deity, a new world would arise and be re-established in the same pristine beauty.* A similar doctrine was embraced by some of the early Christians, as by the author of the Second Epistle to Peter, by Justin Martyr and the Sibyl. The oldest canonical descriptions of the last times shew no acquaintance with this cosmical conflagration. The Apocalypse itself assumes a supernatural evanescence of heaven and earth. The New Testament writings, however, in general agree in representing the advent of Christ, the coming of Antichrist, and the end of the world, as nearly synchronous events, and some of them associate the final consummation with the destruction of Jerusalem. In fact, "the belief in the near approach of the coming of Christ is spoken of or implied in almost every book of the New Testament, in the discourses of our Lord himself as well as in the Acts of the Apostles, in the Epistles of St. Paul no less than in the Book of the Revelation."† This belief in the almost immediate return of Christ is vindicated by an eloquent divine,‡ on the ground that without it the apostles could hardly have been induced to crowd so much superhuman energy into so small a compass, or the Christians to realize that union which startled the world into the recognition of the new

---

* Cicero, De Naturâ Deorum, xlvi.

† Jowett's Epistles of St. Paul, Vol. I. p. 108.

‡ Rev. Frederick Robertson, Life and Letters.

religion as a life and not "merely a philosophy." The expectation of the millennial advent of Christ was the persistent characteristic of the primitive church of Papias and Irenæus, of Tertullian and Hippolytus. In the remote antiquity of that church, "all things were read in the light of the approaching end of the world." Descending the stream of time, we find countless fanatics in Germany, France and Italy, declaring that the thousand Apocalyptic years were about to expire, and announcing the almost immediate return of the Son of Man. The longing for the Holy Land, which was the distinguishing sentiment of the tenth century, was associated with the conviction that Jerusalem was the appointed theatre of the Last Judgment. Under the influence of this conviction, men sold their goods and possessions, suffered churches and other noble edifices to fall into decay, and knights, citizens and serfs, travelled eastward in company, to await in Jerusalem the expected event. In the thirteenth century, the Abbot Joachim, of Floris in Calabria, a devout student of the Apocalypse, announced that the final catastrophe would take place in A.D. 1260. During the great plague which ravaged Europe about the middle of the fourteenth century, it was generally considered that the end of the world was at hand, and predictions were hazarded that within ten years the trump of the archangel would sound and the Saviour appear in the clouds. The Apocalyptic or Sibylline burthen, testifying to the continued existence of this imposing expectation, thrilled through the hearts of men at a still later period. Its echo is heard in the grand old Church hymn, with which modern poetry and psalmody have made most of us familiar, the Dies Iræ, a word on which may not be unwelcome here.

The first mention of the Dies Iræ appears to occur in a work by Bartholomew of Pisa, in 1401. By him it is attributed to Brother Thomas of Celano, an early follower of St. Francis of Assisi. He asserts, moreover, that it was written at the Papal command; and his words justify the inference that it was sung in requiem masses as early as the date at which he wrote. As it does not seem to occur in German, French or English Missals of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, it was probably used at first in Franciscan churches. Afterwards, when the Roman Missal passed into more general use, it was ordered to be sung everywhere. In this

solemn hymn, a reverberation of Sibylline poetry, we still trace the influence of the old Christian muse of the first century, when she sang,

> "A fire shall come into the world, and these signs shall appear in it."

Of the continued influence of Sibylline tradition, from the centuries before Heraclitus down to the pontificate of Pope Julius II., we have a still more magnificent illustration in the unrivalled work of the sovereign artist who covered the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel with the mighty forms of Prophet and Sibyl, in whom the Church recognized the anticipative hierophants of the supreme mystery of her faith. From the frescoes of the curved expanse look down the great living shapes which the sublime spirit of Michael Angelo Buonarotti created. There may be traced the massive figure of the Delphic Sibyl, holding the prophetic scroll and gazing upward with eyes luminous with inspiration. There may be traced the weird form of the Erythræan Sibyl, turning leaves that tremble with the fate of empires, as she sits in majestic repose, and puts forth one mighty arm to clasp the mystic book. There may be seen the colossal form of the Cumæan Sibyl, conning in an open volume the lives that tell of the great expectation that holds the world in awe. There may be seen the Persian Sibyl, spelling the dark prophecy of the land which listened to her burning words; and, lastly, there may be seen the Libyan Sibyl, throwing back the huge volume of her prophetic lore.

In this wonderful series of superhuman shapes, the great artist, no doubt, designed to symbolize the harmonious approximation of the Heathen and Christian world to a common centre of hope and thought and life. For though the Pagan Sibyl that witnessed to the truth of the sacred story was but a pious fable, the typical reconciliation thus portrayed of Hellenic thought with Christian sentiment may be accepted as an earnest of that good-will towards men which was the common aspiration of Plato and Jesus. So, too, the conquest of the Spirit of Evil, appearing now in the form of an ancient, now of a modern emperor,—now as the embodiment of secular, now of spiritual tyranny,—now as the outward expression of popular superstition and ignorance, now as the manifestation of violent and unscrupulous

self-regard,—is in our sceptical days, no less than in those of the believing poet of Patmos, the ideal end to which all aspirations and efforts should be directed. Thus a truth, or foreshadowing of a truth, is still discernible in the wild and beautiful vision of St. John, though his expectation of the world's immediate end be an illusion, and though his drama of the revival and return of the last of the Cæsars resolves itself into such stuff as dreams are made of, the unsubstantial fabric of a Nero-Saga.

W. M. W. Call.

II.—THE FRENCH THEOPHILANTHROPISTS.

In the month of April 1798, some observant citizens of Paris found themselves witnesses in their great national cathedral of the celebration of a new species of worship, which by its simplicity contrasted greatly with the pomp and grandeur of the ordinary services of the place. Not without active opposition had Catholicism yielded this privilege to what it considered deadly heresy. Compelled to give way by the spirit of the times, it surrendered its exclusiveness with extreme reluctance, and received its self-intruded neighbour with the jealousy which it thought due to a rival, and with a dread of what appeared the inevitable consequences. The high altar, which no unhallowed rites could be allowed to profane, was removed into the nave, and the organ whose use the intruders could not be refused was surrendered. In consequence, two forms of worship were conducted under the same roof, which did not ill represent two representative states of mind then prevalent in the capital of France—the intensely conservative and the subdued revolutionary.

On the same Sunday similar scenes might have been seen in eleven other different Catholic churches in Paris. That number arose shortly to eighteen. In some cases the new worship had sole possession of the sacred edifice. Even the old names were changed. Only a few months were required to effect so marvellous a revolution.

Revolution was the order of the day in France when the

gorgeous rites of Romanism thus gave way to the cold, tame and colourless observances of Theophilanthropy. Yet its pace had at the moment somewhat slackened. The Directory held the reins of government (1795—1799). Its functions were victory abroad and restoration at home. The spirit of its administration tended to calm men's passions and to correct their follies. It aimed to establish society on a moral, if not a religious foundation. Already had Robespierre restored the national recognition of God, when a few individuals of little mark, but more thoughtful than others, resolved to found a new religion. An astounding enterprize! What was the result?

The attempt was made by five persons. To give their names is to shew their insignificance as compared with the magnitude of their undertaking. Those names are Chemin, Janes, Marcau, Hauy, Mandar. Only one of these emerges out of obscurity. Hauy, originally a schoolmaster, receives a very brief notice in Biographical Dictionaries as the originator of the system of teaching the blind to read by appeals to the sense of touch through the aid of letters in relief. In thus accurately describing these persons, we intend no disparagement. In the then state of society, the attempt, if Quixotic, was praiseworthy. It is ever good and right for men to do their best in the service of God and man; and at this the first moment of breathing-time for the spirit of social sound-mindedness, it was noble to try to restore the old foundations, so far as they corresponded to the moral and religious wants of the age. Nay, there was something heroic in the attempt made by those five ordinary men. Avowed Atheism was in the ascendent. Ridicule and scorn awaited all that belonged not to its ranks. Even the national restoration of God tottered on its uneasy throne. The old religion, downcast and trodden on, bided its time in sullen vindictiveness, starting now and then into destructive activity against every attempt at moderate improvement. One such step had called forth its special fury. The Directory had decreed the freedom and equality of all forms of religion. This, which was death to exclusiveness, offered an opening to reformers. The opportunity was seized by our five heads of families.

We propose to sketch their scheme, and to follow the sketch with an outline of its brief history.

The scheme itself is described in the following terms, translated from an authoritative exposition, entitled, *Manuel des Theophilanthropes*, &c., which, written by Chemin, sets forth the views of the founders, and supplies forms observed in their worship to which we shall anon refer:

"Several fathers of families, persuaded that religious principles are the only solid basis of a good education, the only restraint on secret crimes, the best consolation in adversity, the most efficacious encouragement in the performance of duty, have united in order to adopt means for rescuing their children from the perils of irreligion. They have reflected that the mysterious forms of worship have many adversaries, that most young people being brought up under those forms, are, when in the world, unable to withstand the numerous arguments by which they are assailed, and that frequently, in renouncing those mysteries, they at the same time part with religion and morality. In consequence, they have been led to think that the surest way was to imbue their children's minds with the principles of natural religion, which none but the corrupt or the senseless can attack; that once accustomed to conduct themselves according to the principles of that religion, which is respected by all nations and is the basis of all existing forms of worship, they will probably never renounce it, and, as a natural result, be worthy men and women to the day of their death.

"In order to remind their children the more frequently and the more efficaciously of the principles of that religion, they have agreed to observe in union with them, at certain fixed times, certain practices, external indeed, but very simple, and the object of which is very easily apprehended.

"In doing so, we do not propose to the human race either a new religion or a new form of worship. Our religion is the universal religion, our worship goes back to the first ages of the world, and in the statement of our doctrine it will be seen that we are friends of all the forms of worship on the earth; we respect their dogmas, we practise their morality; even the name which we give to our system does not describe it alone, but all those forms of religion which have for their object to lead men to worship God and to love their fellow-creatures. Thus 'Theophilanthropy' *(the love of God and man)*, far from creating a new sect, tends to combine existing sects in a single sentiment, that of piety, of love, of concord, of toleration. The pretext of religion has shed too much blood. This code will teach men that it is easy to agree, that in reality they do agree, in the essential principles of religion and morality, and that certain

differences in their opinions and usages ought not to break the bonds of fraternity which the Author of Nature has established among all his children."*

Of this programme a French author of repute has spoken in the following commendatory terms:

"Those who without prejudice examine the basis of this institution will judge that in the circumstances it was eminently necessary. Its authors do not profess a new religion; they respect all existing religions; they rigorously abstain from all declamation against such; they pity without blaming persons beset with error and given up to the superstitions of all the sects; and they recommend the duties which bind individuals to their families, and families to society. Nothing is found in their system which can give birth to hateful passions, schisms, controversies; nothing to inflame ambition or the love of riches; few ceremonies, and none of them open to ridicule. No oath, no undertaking, no threats, no severities. You hear the voice of reason, the lessons of experience, which avail to introduce into all hearts the principles of justice and honour. The system was a course of morality. No one can, without being pleased as well as moved, read the social principles, the moral precepts, inscribed on the walls of the hall in which the Theophilanthropists conducted their worship. Take as an example:

"'We believe in the existence of God and the immortality of the soul.

"'Worship God, love your fellow-men, be useful to your country.

"'Good is that which tends to preserve man and to perfect him.

"'Evil is that which tends to destroy or deteriorate him.

"'Children, honour your fathers and mothers, and obey them lovingly; solace them in age: fathers and mothers, instruct your children.

"'Wives, see in your husbands the heads of your houses; let husbands and wives render each other happy.'"†

Doubtless the aim is good, and the means are not without points of excellence. Yet the scheme lies open to serious objections, and in those objections reasons may be found why it was so short-lived.

There is a fundamental error in the notion that Theo-

---

* Introduction.

† Dulaure, in D'Anquetil's Histoire de France, Vol. III. p. 543.

philanthropy in its essence was, as the most ancient, so the universal religion. It was very unwise in its founders to put forth so general a statement at a time when almost nothing was known of the history of religion. Since their day the subject has been profoundly studied. The result is to be found in conclusions which rest on the broadest and deepest basis. The earliest religion was not Monotheism, but the worship of Nature. In religion, the only thing that is universal is what may be called religiousness, or a natural aptitude for religion, resembling the aptitude for reasoning or for the propagation of the human species. Emphatically true of the earlier ages, this statement remains true to-day. The religion of the aborigines of Central Africa or Central South America agrees with the religion of the cultivated Englishman only in this facultative particular.

Then as to sects. Theophilanthropy doubtless added another sect to the ten thousand already in existence, and in doing so did nothing but what was natural, and, as natural, right and beneficial. It was natural that the particular form of religious thought called Theophilanthropy should arise in reflecting minds at that time of day and in that land. Being natural, it had a right to be uttered, and the suppression of it would have been wrong. It presented an aspect of the religious life which it was useful and therefore desirable for men to know. The progress of society is secured, not by the effacement of its factors, but by their due presentation and enforcement. The fear of sects is a relic of the old but now perishing system of ecclesiastical exclusiveness, whose sense of injustice and weakness kept it in constant dread of competition and rivalry. God's truth hails variety and discussion, as God's own path to ever-increasing freedom, activity, light, health and strength. It is not sects that we need fear, but the spirit of sectism, or the *esprit de corps* of which ecclesiasticism is the most rigid and the most baneful.

And here is the right place to say a word of the unprofessional character of the five founders of Theophilanthropy. We remark that they were not clerics, but laymen. "Several fathers of families" is their own description of themselves. This was a movement in the right direction. Jesus was the son of a family; not a priest, nor a levite,

nor a philosopher, but simply a man and a son. As such he was incrusted with no class or caste prejudices, but open to all the light and all the moral power and all the religious inspiration which God in his providence can communicate to a man. And if these five laymen failed in knowledge which was to be possessed a generation or two afterwards by students, their cloud was shared by the priests, if not by the philosophers, of their day, while they enjoyed a purity of light, a breadth of vision and a simple earnestness of purpose, which did not fall to the lot of priest or noble or king. It was a great thing to see that religion needed support, was capable of reformation, and that the wider its basis, the surer its structure. This was a great thing, but it was a greater to attempt the needful task. If reformers had waited till their knowledge was complete, social progress would have been impossible. We heartily thank those five fathers for the example they set, and our thanks would be fuller had they not been tempted to conciliate evil by adopting two or three of its flimsy veils. One of these is the allegation that they respected sacerdotal dogmas and practised sacerdotal morals. Had they done the former, they would not have condemned superstitions and mysteries, that is unintelligible dogmas enforced by anathema, and so have forfeited all claim to be mentioned in after days; had they done the latter, they would have been priests rather than men and fathers, with certainly narrow and unprolific hearts, and probably a morality as little fit for priests as for men and fathers. They put themselves forward in opposition to clerical dogmas and clerical morals, and so have deservedly gained a space—a small one it may be, but still a space—in religious history and the history of the world. True is it that the system was "a course of morality." But no less true that the course has for its principle a utilitarianism which admits of nothing morally great and sublime. Good cannot be identified with the preservation of man. Often supreme duty involves the sacrifice of man. It did so in Jesus, and hence Jesus is the light and the life of the world; also its glory and its majesty; also its moral and spiritual power. And it is because the new religion lacks that power, it is on that account chiefly, that some five or six years measure the period of its duration. Even the perfecting

of human nature is not the absolute good, unless you make it appear that man is the highest of beings, and his good the universal good. There is but one good in the world, and that is God, and God's glory in the realization of his wise and benignant purposes for each and all of his creatures, whether rational or irrational, whether animal, vegetable or material. The Theophilanthropic morality is unsound in its core.

This fact appears also in the precept which requires wives to own their masters in their husbands. This is simply domestic slavery, and wherever observed it engenders the evils inherent in slavery, in number and virulence greater or less. Here, again, the true code of ethics is given by Jesus, when, reproducing the Mosaic doctrine, he taught that husband and wife are one—one ideal being (Matt. xix. 5 ; Gen. i. 27).

These principles were to be expounded from the press and from what we may term the pulpit. Specially were they to be fostered and promoted by the solemnities of prayer and sacred song. A still more efficacious way for their inculcation existed in the kind of religious tutelage with which, after the manner of the Church, the new religion environed the human being by associating itself with him in the more momentous epochs of being, namely, birth, marriage and death. The principal literary efforts were, "The Theophilanthropic Manual" (Manuel Théophilanthropique), "The Theophilanthropic Year" (L'Année Théophilanthropique), and "What is Theophilanthropy?" (Qu'est ce que la Théophilanthropie?), all three from the pen of Chemin. These writings, being widely diffused, made the system known, and still remain as the authentic records of its character and aims. Moreover, they contained the liturgical and instructional forms which were used in public worship. That worship was superintended by one who from the nature of his office bore the name of "The Reader." Above him, however, stood "The Orator," or public speaker (the preacher), who taught the community according to the principles accepted by it. The Reader and the Orator were both to be married men or widowers,—a proof how fully the domestic principle was recognized by the Theophilanthropists, and scarcely less a silent protest against the celibacy of the Catholic clergy. The readings of the one and the lectures

of the other were to be anteriorly accepted by the Council, of which neither of them was a member, and in which they had no other functions than such as are consultative. In time it was expected that the part of the Orator would be absorbed in that of the Reader. Accordingly, in his "Theophilanthropic Year," Chemin published addresses and lectures which were to be read to the congregations, thus stamping the services with monotony and hindering the free development of thought and mental power. This was a very poor way of providing pabulum and exercise for the human mind. One advantage did accrue, namely, that since a simple head of a family could conduct the worship both at home and in the public assembly, the gradual formation of a priesthood was precluded. Yet the benefit was purchased too dearly at the cost of losing the vivid and ever-varying utterance of religious truth from the living and overflowing sources of personal and individual experience.

The readings, instead of being taken from the Bible, as in Christian worship, were borrowed from moralists and philosophers, ancient and modern. Socrates, Pythagoras, Confucius, Phocylides, were, as well as Moses and Jesus, the recognized teachers of the Theophilanthropic worshipers. This diversity of instruction is a strong recommendation in the eyes of Chemin. Reserving the question of the religion of the new sect for later criticism, we must say that the price paid here, as well as before, was too large, for the spiritual influence of the Bible is touching and quickening beyond the highest products of the human mind. A curious illustration of the extent of mental freedom granted by the government is presented in the fact that the Orator, who alone had the privilege of free speech in the church, was compelled to declare obedience to the laws of his country, and not until the averment had appeared on the walls of the temple during four months, could he enter on his functions. The Orator, while engaged in his duty, wore a costume which distinguished him at once from the ordinary worshipers as well as from the Catholic and the Protestant clergy. It consisted in a blue dress-coat covered by a white gown or surplice, girded with a rose-coloured girdle. "This attire," says Chemin, "is simple and grave, like that of Protestant ministers; but while supplying no aliment to

vanity, it offered a happy mixture of white, red and blue, which, announcing an amiable moralist, formed a ground on which the spectator's eye rested with pleasure." Nevertheless, it was incongruous in a form of worship which owned no other priesthood than the one universal priesthood of humanity. It must, however, be added that little importance was assigned to this distinctive costume by the members of the body, and its enemies might therefore have spared it the raillery in which they indulged on this subject.

In the centre of the hall rose an altar, on which was placed a basket of the flowers or the fruits of the season, as a token of thankfulness to the bountiful Creator. In front and above the altar there was fixed a tablet which bore this inscription: "We believe in the existence of God and the immortality of the soul." On each side of this tablet were two others, presenting the sentences already given in definition of good and evil, and in exposition of domestic relations and duties, as well as the adoration of God and service to individuals and to their common country. Opposite the altar was a desk or pulpit, in which the minister, standing and uncovered, recited aloud an invocation, which the hearers repeated in an under-tone, in the same attitude; thus in this, as in other already alleged particulars, presenting a mutilated and tame copy of the liturgical services of the Christian Church. The remark is made not for blame, but to exemplify the difficulty that exists in departing from ancient usages without detriment, if you resolve to preserve any of its forms. Then, as if in imitation of the Society of Friends, came a short period of silence, during which each one was expected to give himself an account of his conduct since the last meeting. This over, the congregation resumed their seats to listen to the discourse or the reading that followed. These exercises were intermingled with hymns, consecrated generally to the celebration of the majesty of God, his wisdom and his benefactions, filial piety, youth, marriage, liberty, the successive seasons, the sovereignty of the people. Among these "spiritual songs," several are taken from the best lyric poets of France. Racine and J. B. Rousseau had been laid under contribution. The airs were for the most part grave, religious and free. The hymn of Cleanthes, translated by Louis Racine, made part of the collection; also that written by Desorgues "for the festival

of the Supreme Being," which, though somewhat philosophic and cold, possesses remarkable religious elevation and poetic beauty. The greater number of the Theophilanthropic hymns are fine; but it must not be passed in silence that no hymn of the Old Testament, no psalm of David, has place in the selection. Naturally, Chemin considered this part of the service superior to what is found anywhere else. "The Protestants," he says, "sing in the vernacular, like the Theophilanthropists, with this difference, that they use the Psalms of David translated into bad French, to monotonous and drawling tunes, but which yet touch the heart because all present easily follow the leading of the choir; while the Theophilanthropists make their temples reverberate with the finest odes of J. B. Rousseau, or other hymns, which generally unite literary merit with grandeur of thought or wisdom of precept, to airs in general no less beautiful, and which produce the most impressive effect when sung as with one voice by a whole assembly." Doubtless the French of Racine, of J. B. Rousseau, and even of Desorgues, is far preferable to that of Marot. Nevertheless, for religious inspiration nothing equals the book of Psalms. Indeed, the useful was too much obtruded in the Manual of Theophilanthropic song, to be a true, natural and effective expression of gratitude and worship to Almighty God. Not his glory, but man's edification, was the principal aim,—an aim in connection with which piety and poetry could ill flourish. The Theophilanthropic worship was at first celebrated on the decade or tenth day which the Convention had substituted as a day of rest for the first day or Sunday of the Christian Church. At a later time, when Sunday recovered favour and the decade fell into disuse, the Theophilanthropists observed originally both days, but ended by confining their worship to "the first day of the week," or, as it was called in the earliest ages, "the Resurrection Day."

Besides these ordinary holidays, the Theophilanthropists kept all the festivals adopted by the Convention, such as the festival of the Convention itself, of wedlock, of old age, of misfortune; they also observed special religious days, as that on the death of General Hoche, the pacificator of La Vendée; of General Joubert, who all but gained supreme power under the Directory; of the French plenipotentiaries assassi-

nated at Rastadt; of great men of all places, all times, all churches; of Socrates, J. J. Rousseau, Washington, and even of the great Catholic philanthropist, Saint Vincent de Paul. On the 23rd of January, 1798, they celebrated in the temple of Victory the anniversary of what they termed the re-establishment of natural religion. This festival was in their minds intended to symbolize the union of all men and all religions. Five banners were carried by five heads of families, on each of which appeared one of these words: *Religion, Morality, Jews, Catholics, Protestants.* At an appointed moment, the man that carried the banner of Religion united the four other banners in his hand with his own, giving to their bearers the kiss of peace. He then uttered these words: "In the name of all men, whether they externally profess a religion based on different dogmas and embellished by different ceremonies, or, presenting no visible sign of religion to the public, they satisfy themselves by giving a pledge on behalf of the simple practice of virtue."

That the Theophilanthropists were sincere friends of religious liberty, and, so far as their light went, effectual advocates of its principles, is illustrated in the fact, that, with a view to its encouragement and furtherance, they had a particular festival in honour of toleration. On one occasion the ceremony was conducted in the Catholic church of Saint Germain l'Auxerrois in Paris,—a striking proof of the extent to which society had floated away from its old moorings! The celebration of these religious festivals was generally marked by the free distribution of books suited to expound and recommend the new form of belief and worship. The "Reflections of Lareveillère on Worship," the "Counsels of a Father to his Son" by François de Neufchâteau, were profusely given away on the day of the festival of Natural Religion.

It is curious to remark that an imitation of the Romish sacraments was practised by the Theophilanthropists. A new-born child was brought into the church at the moment when the worship was terminating. The child's father declared his infant's name, already given before the civil authority, presenting the child to the head of a family who had officiated in the public service. Then, while the child's father held it aloft in his hands, he was addressed by the minister in these words: "You promise before God and

man to bring up that child, N., in the doctrine of the Theophilanthropists, to breathe into it, at the dawn of its intelligence, belief in the existence of God, the immortality of the soul; to make it sensible of the necessity of worshiping God, of loving its fellow-men, and of being useful to the State?" To which the child's father replied, "I promise it." Without making it an absolute obligation, the Theophilanthropists recommended the appointment of godfathers and godmothers, and when such appeared before him the officiant said to them: "You promise before God and man to stand to this child in the place of its father and mother, so far as you can, should they be unable to bestow their own cares on it?" "We promise it." Then the minister addressed the family circle on the duties of fathers, mothers, and all who have the charge of children.

In the Catholic Church, a child's "first communion" is an important event. The first time he receives the consecrated wafer, the child publicly becomes the property of the Church. A special course of religious instruction prepares for the sacred solemnity. Here, again, the force of imitation was felt and acknowledged by the Theophilanthropists. In the midst of fathers, mothers, children, aunts, uncles, cousins, all rejoicing at the approach of A.'s first communion, they could not endure the reproach of singularity, and so instituted a sort of mock first communion. And yet they knew that Romanism was fast losing its hold on society, at least in its upper strata, and might have divined what has now all but universally taken place in France, in regard to male children, namely, that their first communion is also their last. However, every year its children were conducted through a course of specific instruction which lasted three or four months. At the end of that time, those who had distinguished themselves by their zeal and diligence were publicly received into the society, after undergoing an examination designed to ascertain their progress, and after promising before the congregation to faithfully profess the Theophilanthropic doctrine and to persevere in virtue. Again promises! and promises from children not only to observe, but to believe and own, certain practices and certain forms of opinion! Alas for human inconsistency!

The ceremony of marriage presented some peculiarities.

The Theophilanthropic benediction might be given either in the temple or in the home of the bride; the head of the family presided on the occasion. The bridal pair, intertwined with flowers and ribands, held at the two extremities by the seniors of the two families, approached the altar, when the head of the house, addressing each in succession, asked: "You have taken B. for your husband?" S. "Yes." "You have taken S. for your wife?" B. "Yes." Then the husband presented a ring to his wife. This done, the father gave them a union medal, and ended with an address on the duties of wedded life. Sometimes, in recollection of the happy event and as a symbol of duties to be fulfilled in regard to future generations, they planted trees; they also occasionally grafted on wild trees of the wood shoots of fruit fit to satisfy the traveller's hunger or thirst. It was a day of domestic rejoicings.—The funeral rites were simple and touching. After the interment, which took place according to the custom observed in the defunct's native land, the relatives and friends assembled in the temple, where their eyes were saluted by these words on a tablet: "Death is the commencement of immortality." Sometimes an urn, shaded with foliage, was placed in front of the altar. The officiating father said, addressing those present: "Death has stricken one of our fellow-creatures." If the deceased had reached the years of reason, he added: "Let us forget his faults; let us bear his virtues in mind; may this event be a warning to us to be always ready to appear before the Supreme Judge of our actions." Sometimes there also ensued some reflections on death and the immortality of the soul.—Such were the forms and ceremonies of the Theophilanthropic worship. The Manual expressly recommended that their number should not be increased nor their simplicity impaired.*

"You will be told often that it is necessary to strike the senses of the multitude by pomp and show. Those who say this know little of the human heart. Let the people recite your songs; let decency and piety reign in your festivals; let the hymns, the readings, the lectures touch the heart; let them be perspicuous and contain only precepts agreeable to universal reason; then you will have no need of ceremonies! Endure not

---

P. 31.

even one, though it appear to you simple and unlikely to be followed. As soon as you have introduced the first, the second will be sure to ensue, then the third, and soon your worship will altogether lose its character; the people will make more of the ceremonies than of the precepts, and inevitably fall into superstition."

The Manual adds:

"What we say of ceremonies applies to monuments in the churches. Let a decent simplicity prevail there. Admit no sculpture, picture or engraving, having for its object to represent, be it the Deity or any of his attributes; be it any human virtue, or other objects purely intellectual, which can be figured only by allegories, and consequently in an always unfaithful manner. Admit no representation of any personage, because the most virtuous men have their weaknesses, and because no mortal's image is worthy to be placed in the shrine of the Deity. At the utmost you may ornament your temples with the products of God's own hands, or the representation of virtuous deeds indicated in a general way and without any individual's being characterized therein. We think the maintenance of these principles very important, in order to keep at a distance every inclination towards superstition and idolatry."

The principal doctrines of the Theophilanthropists are implicated in this sketch of their rites and usages. Here happily the name denotes the worshiper. A Theophilanthropist is in virtue of his Greek appellation *a lover of God and man.*

Belief in God and a future life, which the Theophilanthropists hold as the sole essentials of religion and the sufficient sources of virtue and happiness, rests, according to them, on two facts; namely, the visible order and the moral order of the world. The universe proclaims the "Great First Cause. Our intelligence assures us of our superiority to matter, while that superiority involves our endless duration."

"The existence of God and the immortality of the soul," says the Manual, "have no need of long demonstrations. These are truths of sentiment which each one finds in his own heart, if in good faith he goes down into its depths. Only bad men can doubt on the point, and this they do because the thought of a just God disturbs their criminal enjoyments.

"Moreover, in order to be satisfied of the truth of this belief, you need only consider its salutary effects.

"A system which renders men good, compassionate, scrupulous as to all duty, cannot be erroneous. That which tends to persuade men that they may be rapacious, ungrateful, cruel, even parricides, and that the only crime is to be detected in misdoing, cannot be true. Yet such is the system which denies the existence of God and the immortality of the soul."*

Without stopping to confirm our doubt as to whether the Manual places these solemn issues in their proper light, we cannot pass on without protesting against the clericalism which identifies Atheism with vice, and by implication denies that an Atheist can be honest. Without intending to give any countenance to Atheism, we claim for those who espouse it the full privilege of free thought and free speech, and that privilege cannot be enjoyed while any abstract opinion is branded as, in its source, immoral or impious. We fear our Theophilanthropic friends, with all their liberality, had not been fully cured of the taint of intolerance. In the intellectual arena, Atheism has as much right to fair-play as Theism, and unbelief will certainly never be cured by indiscriminately referring it to vice of character. As to questions touching what God is, what the soul is, what the future life will be, wherein will lie reward and punishment hereafter,—these the Theophilanthropists pronounce indiscreet and presumptuous.

"They hold that man cannot know God, and are satisfied in recognizing his existence as taught by the harmony and beauty of the universe, by the unanimous testimony of humanity, and that of the individual conscience. The testimony involves the fact of his being perfectly good and just, and therein implicates reward and punishment in futurity. On another side, convinced that error is easy to man, that our opinions often depend on circumstances over which we are not masters, the Theophilanthropists hold that God will not judge us according to our opinions or the forms of our worship, but rather according to our affections and our deeds. Accordingly they take special care not to persecute their brethren on account of their opinions; they try to convince them by persuasion; and if they fail, none the less do they feel toward them esteem and friendship. It is only crime they abhor, and they employ all their efforts to bring the wicked back to goodness."†

---

* P. 13.

† Pp. 14, 15.

What more needs be said of the history of Theophilanthropy is, for the most part, a history of its decline, decay and death. As a relief from the gloom which particulars of the kind tend to call forth, we shall end with a sketch or two of the more prominent Theophilanthropists.

The earliest meetings of the sect were held in what may be termed a chapel, contiguous to the Blind Asylum, conducted by Hauy. As, however, religious equality had received national sanction, and as Catholicism, the national religion, was under a thick cloud in a stormy sky, the religious reformers claimed the right to use the national churches for the celebration of their public worship. The claim was so offensive to the Catholic clergy, that it would have been successfully resisted but for a certain patronage bestowed on the claimants by the Government. The actual exercise of the right thus obtained was not least among the external causes of its speedy supercession and the extinction of the movement. Grievously wounding the sentiments of the Catholic priesthood, trampling its fondest and most sacred associations under foot, and apparently aiming to abolish the religion which it believed it had received from seventeen centuries of endeared and venerated memory, the new system created for itself an embittered and ruthless enemy which was sure to prove a formidable assailant. And after the storms and tempests of the revolution, fine weather might be expected. Again Romanism lifted up its head in France. Among its first acts was the demolition of Theophilanthropy. Superstition originated and directed the blow; political expediency dealt it. Ambition must not be fastidious as to the means it employs. Napoleon III. sustained his usurped and perjured throne by the buttress (such as it was!) of the papacy. Similar aid was desired by Napoleon I., who, to conciliate Rome, abolished Theophilanthopy. And yet, such is the declaration of history,* "the generality of the French was at that epoch so indifferent in the matter of religion, that Bonaparte said a simple order of the day was the only thing needed to make all his soldiers, his officers and his generals, turn Mohammedans."

Indeed, a political element had more or less been a

---

* D'Anquetil, p. 544.

source of weakness to Theophilanthropy from the beginning. In France, the State has taken part in everything, and not least in religion. Such a thing as the free rise of new sects and new religious efforts, which we daily witness in England, has been impossible. And there, far more than even here, what the State touches it is sure to enfeeble. With the fall of the Directory, Theophilanthropy fell. The fall was prepared by a false opinion spread in the public mind that the new religion received direct and official support from the Government. As in consequence the Directory lost favour, Theophilanthropy fell into disrepute. Indeed, it has been said that "its success scarcely lasted more than three years; born on the 16th of December, 1796, it was rapidly declining toward the end of the year 1799; doubtless it lived after it had lost the sympathy of the State and the favour of public opinion, but a watchful eye would have seen it decline day after day; at the end of 1799 its worship was held, not in eighteen Parisian churches, but in only four." Deserted by the large number of persons who had joined it from personal considerations, it was assailed not merely by indifference and disregard, but ridicule, contempt and even hatred. Soon its worship was troubled by tumult and violence. One day the worshipers were driven by main force from the church of St. Gervais. A little later (Jan. 12, 1801), in the same temple, their altar was demolished, their decorations and inscriptions torn down or defaced; even the banner bearing the motto, "Liberty of Worship," and suspended over the pulpit, was seized and burnt in the middle of the church. Similar manifestations took place in the provinces. The public life of the system was at an end. It survived solely in one or two private families. At present even its name is scarcely known, except to students.

The names it has left on the page of history are neither numerous nor considerable. Of its founder Chemin, little more is known than what the reader is already made acquainted with. A teacher of Latin in Paris, he was a man pure in life and faithful to his principles, which he did not desert after the society was dissolved.

If the name of Hauy is in some sense historical, it is owing not to the philanthropist himself, so much as to his brother, the Abbé Hauy, a distinguished mineralogist (1743

—1822). A weaver's son, he became a priest and a teacher in the College of Navarre. Having one day let a piece of spar fall, he noticed with astonishment that the fragments preserved a regular and constant form. The mind that could see the fact had power to turn it to account. The science of Crystallography was the consequence. Among the names which are now merely names, it deserves mention, as indicative of the dissolution of theological systems which was then rapidly proceeding, that several had been Catholic priests or Protestant ministers. Others had been members of different forms of parliamentary representatives.

One of these, Siauve, beginning life as a priest, and distinguishing himself by a report made to the National Assembly on collegiate education, found employment as an upper clerk in the offices of the Minister at War, and was afterward sent into the Council of Five Hundred. A practised writer on history, art and agriculture, he exercised his pen on behalf of Theophilanthropy, by editing L'Echo des Cercles Patriotiques et des Unions Theophilanthropes. The blending of politics and religion exemplified in this title appeared in other movements of the society, and, bringing with it some advantage, went far to entail its ruin.

Better known than Siauve was Dupont de Nemours, also a deputy to the National Assembly, a man of vast knowledge, being equally familiar with history, philosophy and jurisprudence. As an economist, he was held in high estimation for important publications, and was honoured with the friendship of Quesnay and Turgot, the latter of whom he aided in his reformatory labours. He had made himself known before the Revolution, having taken part in the recognition of the United States by France, and prepared a treaty of commerce with England. No one carried into the Assembly a more sagacious mind, or more firmness allied with moderation. He procured the removal of the tax on salt, and pleaded the cause of the negroes. A liberal royalist, he, on the 10th of August, 1792, hurried with his son to the Tuileries in order to defend the king, whom he courageously accompanied from his palace to the Assembly. "Dupont," said Louis XVI. to him, "we find you wherever we have need of you." This scholar and excellent man, saddened by the successive revolutions through which France passed without coming to anything but despotism or anar-

chy, sought relief by emigrating to America, where he ended his days. "Amiable" (so he is described by Lacretelle, to whom he was personally known), "animated, full of honour and courage, born for labour, open to illusions, systematic in thought, he fancied he was always advancing toward a golden age, the product of reason. Injustice and crime made him boil with indignation; doubtless he, too, paid tribute to error; but I have never known a person more ready to sacrifice to friendship or the public welfare the interests of his fortune or those of his fame." The Baron de Gerando also has rendered to him this honourable testimony: "Loved in society, where his conversation was always agreeable and striking, original and open-hearted, taking pleasure in the midst of children, rich in domestic affection, a model, a support and a joy of home, he was seen wherever there was good to be done, calm and indefatigible, making that into a duty which ordinary men accounted superfluous zeal."

A name better known, though not less worthy, was Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, whose *Paul and Virginia* and *The Indian Cottage* are doubtless familiar to our younger readers. This disciple and friend of Jean Jacques Rousseau, this eloquent and beloved bard of the beauties of nature, was a member of the society of Theophilanthropists, and is recorded to have on one occasion come forward as a godfather. Of a lofty character, he was sincere and firm in his religious sentiments, in the hourly exercise of which he was supported and consoled in the midst of no ordinary trials. "Suffering," he often said, "inspires confidence in God which surpasses every earthly good." Admitted to the high honour of the Institute in 1795, he was in 1798 appointed by the section of "Moral and Political Sciences" to report on an open discussion of the grave question, "What are the Institutions on which Public Morality may be best founded?" The reading of his report was listened to with attention until he uttered the name of the Deity, when he was assailed by a storm of protests and insults. Bernardin maintained the conclusions to which he had been led. Nevertheless, the Academy decided that the word God should not be pronounced; and the reporter was obliged to publish that part of his report in a separate form.

His amiable and accomplished biographer, the late M. Aimé Martin, touchingly depicts the poetic lover of nature in his last hours:

"He is ill and advanced in years. He has himself carried into his garden that he may take the last look of scenes he had loved well and described so eloquently. It was autumn, and one after another the leaves fell to the ground. Directing his wife's attention to the fact, he remarked: 'To-morrow the withered leaves will have passed away;' and as he saw tears come into her eyes, he added: 'Why useless regret? What thou lovest in me will live for ever. Recall the successive periods of our life, and thou wilt see that something is still to come for us. Was I not a babe in the arms of my nurse? Did I not lisp my thanks and return the caress of my parents? When a young man, I traversed the world with plans of a republic in my portfolio; I was then full of ambition and ill at ease. Afterward my intelligence received light and strength. I drew near to Nature and God. Forthwith my heart prepared for union with its Maker. Thou seest the end of one period has always been the beginning of another. As the close of one day is the herald of another, so death is followed by a new life.'"

The most socially eminent Theophilanthropist must not be left without a few words, Lareveillère Lépeaux (1753—1824). He began his career as a jurist in the Parliament of Paris (1775); but soon quitting the bar to study science, became Professor of Botany at Angers. Drawn into the political whirlpool, he was elected to the Constituent Assembly and the Convention. Playing the part of a patriot and a friend of the Girondists, he drew up, in reply to the Brunswick Manifesto, the decree, entitled "The Propagandist Army;" displayed on the 11th of March, 1793, in opposition to Danton unexpected energy, which postponed for a few days the fall of the Girondists; and escaped from a martyr's death only by what some called a miracle. Reappearing in the political arena, he combated the terrorists, was sent into the Council of the Ancients, and then entered the Directory at the time of its creation. Here he played but a secondary part.

This took place when the society of Theophilanthropists was just coming into existence. Lépeaux' known sympathy with the objects of the new society, the eminence of his position, and a certain degree of favour bestowed by the

Government, gave rise and countenance to the unfounded idea that he was not only the originator of the Theophilanthropy, but its most effectual patron. The Catholic historian De Barante, in his "History of the Directory," speaks of Lépeaux in these terms:

"In his philosophy, which has its source in Rousseau, Lareveillère aimed to be moral and even religious. The religion which he adopted was very vague, consisting in a Deism without dogmas and without consecrated duties. Afterwards he devised a worship and a sort of religious Utopia. He always had the philosophic intolerance and a passionate dislike of Christian practices and priests. When he proceeded to instal his religion, it became his principal business. He was a persecutor; and the foundation of politics was the establishment of his Theophilanthropy, the annihilation of the Catholic religion, and the distrustful and tyrannical suppression of every opinion contrary to the revolutionary Republic."

If in these lines religious hate colours the historian's style, in what follows it directs his hand and supplies the ink. Lépeaux, according to De Barante, was jealous of the papal authority, and Theophilanthropy was an effort on his part to acquire for himself a power similar to that of the Holy Father. It has been said that Lépeaux did his best to convert Bonaparte to his religious views, and that the refusal of the latter occasioned the hate toward him felt by the former. Certainly Bonaparte has left in his Memoirs a portrait of Lépeaux which is by no means flattering: "Hump-backed," the ex-Emperor says, "of the most disagreeable exterior, he had the body of Æsop. He wrote passably, but had little comprehensiveness of mind. He possessed neither business habits nor knowledge of men. The Jardin des Plantes and Theophilanthropy formed all his occupation. He was fanatical by temperament, a sincere but cold patriot, a good citizen, and well-intentioned. He entered the Directory poor, and he left it poor." Here, again, Lareveillère holds in regard to Theophilanthropy a far too important position. He was not its founder, nor did he use it in order to set up for a Deistical Pope. In 1799, the Theophilanthropists published an Address which confirms the words of its actual founder, Chemin: "I can affirm, in the name of all that is most sacred, that neither the Government nor any one of its members took the least

part in its establishment."* In the Address we find these words: "Theophilanthropy arose without any kind of external impulse, direct or indirect; the Institution had been established five months, and the Manual had already appeared, when Citizen Lareveillère read in the Institute an essay, in which he expressed a wish to witness the establishment of a simple form of worship, pervaded by the spirit of religion. Then for the first time we saw him; but, as we had nothing to ask of him, all our connection with him was limited to three visits. We declare aloud that never did that ex-Director do anything either for the society itself or for any of its members." In reality, Lépeaux was one of that numerous class of persons whom reason and reflection had driven away from Catholicism, but whose heart did not cease to be religious. It was a simple love of truth that attached him to Theophilanthropy. One day he, with his wife and two daughters, attended Protestant worship in the Louvre. He reports the impression he received in these words:

"The sight of that numerous auditory, preserving the utmost propriety, ranged in exact order, rising and seating themselves at the same instant; those touching prayers; that purely moral discourse; that choir of a thousand or twelve hundred voices (the whole congregation), repeating in unison the praises of the Lord,—although the temple was entirely destitute of ornament; although the minister had no official vestment, but a dull black gown; and although the poetry and the singing were nothing wonderful;—yet all that produced on those two children an effect so moving, that they burst into tears; their mother and myself did the same."

Lépeaux' marvellous escape, to which we have just referred, has been described by the graphic pen of Lamartine in his History of the Girondists:†

"Lareveillère Lépeaux was among the small number who escaped the guillotine. Denounced on the morning of the fall of the Girondists as their accomplice, a voice cried out with contempt from the summit of *La Montagne*, 'Let *him die quietly*. He has not two days to live.' Lareveillère, in fact, was rapidly approaching death. That voice saved him. But soon after, proscribed with the sixty-three deputies suspected

* Qu'est ce que la Theophilanthropie?

† Book lvi. 19.

of regret for *La Gironde*, he fled under different disguises and into unknown places. Bose, the friend of Madame Roland, and Lareveillère, escaped first to an abandoned hut in the forest of Montmorency. There they passed the winter. When the authorities came to hunt in the forest, Lareveillère and Bose buried themselves under hayricks or heaps of leaves. Falling under suspicion, they separated. Each went, he knew not whither, to beg another asylum. Lareveillère journeyed toward the north. On the following morning a poor peasant gave him a loaf, which the good man was carrying to his son in the fields. At the gates of the little town of Roge, the fugitives met a crowd of people. They were carrying to the town upon a litter a person who was proscribed like himself, and who had committed suicide on the highway. This augury froze his heart. He wandered at night in the cultivated fields; by day he lay in the woods. At last he arrived in a state of extreme exhaustion at the house of a friend. Received as a brother, concealed, taken care of and restored to some degree of health by a generous family, he passed the evil days on which he had fallen under a fictitious name, and yielded himself tranquilly to his favourite study of botany.

"Nothing that lifts humanity toward God ought to be disesteemed. All religious thoughts, even when they are contrary to the age, leave their immortality in their nature. The name of Lareveillère Lépeaux will remain honoured and unblemished, when we reflect that he raised himself to God from the bosom of the prevalent theory of nothingness."

And here lies the permanent merit of Theophilanthropy. Regarded in the abstract, the system looks jejune and shallow. Specially inconsiderable is it as a commonplace syncretism, consisting, as it did, of bits and scraps brought together from many quarters, with no central principle of consolidation. As such, it had no internal and essential life. Thus unable to live itself, it was equally unable to give life to others. Yet, as a reaction to the extreme and desolating negativeness of the day, and as a means of counteraction against the mad carnival of religious, social and political change, it did a work and gained a character which will ever make the study of it interesting as well as beneficial. Nor is the lesson inconsiderable which it teaches to the effect that, like all God's great productions—the crystal, the diamond, vegetable life, animal life, the universe—a religion is not to be built up, as an orrery or a steam-engine, by joints and bands devised by the combined cunning of

human hands, but is given of God whole and entire as if fused and cast out of the forces of the Divine Mind itself, and under the burning waves of the inextinguishable sempiternal Light. Apart from man's action, indeed, religion is but a name, and Christianity did not fall from heaven at once and in one piece, like the fabled shield of Minerva. But man is in the genesis of religion the intelligent channel rather than the primal cause,—a co-operator, indeed, in his own humble way, but an originator only mediately and so far as he is filled and actuated by the Spirit of God. Hence man-constructed systems of religion soon break up and pass away, while divine truth is as durable as the laws of the universe, that is, as God himself. Hence the religion of Jesus, uniting in beautiful and well-adjusted proportion what is real in God and what is best in man, remains on earth and passes to successive generations, the moral and spiritual life of the world. Wise, indeed, is it to accept that gift and live by it, rather than to build, each circle for itself, a house with such materials as it may gather, unpossessed of any adequately cementing power, and left to no other choice for a foundation than the best sand of mere human opinion that may offer itself to our hands. Theophilanthropy, with all its merits, dissolved with the rapidity of an iceberg under the sunshine of a glowing day in spring; but "the word of God liveth and abideth for ever" (1 Pet. i. 23), and may be seen, felt, handled and appropriated in the human and divine qualities of Jesus, "the prince of life" (Acts iii. 15).

There was, finally, a fatal defect in Theophilanthropy considered as an intended substitute for a religion. It did no work. It organized, it carried into effect, no system of beneficent action. It did not "go about doing good." Here was the canker-worm at its root. The absence of this, the vitalizing element of active mercy and succouring aid, reduced the enterprize to a mere morality, and a morality of very little power. All the vital moral forces of the world have been made real and efficacious by action. A good and happy home was never formed by precepts, however wise and lofty. The life of a nation is the concentrated life of its great actors as well as thinkers. What is this majestic universe but God himself in beneficent action? What is the animating spirit of an all-conquering army? The active

heroism of its commander, which, proceeding from its centre, radiates its own life and its power of success into the remotest member of the whole organism. Accordingly the principal cause of the triumph of Christianity exists in its beneficent activities. And here Catholicism takes the first position in its scouts, its pioneers, and even in the rank and file of its army. No! preaching is not Christianity, nor even worship. Possibly these instruments may do positive harm, unless vivified by work. Apart from work, religion is little else than an empty form which is likely to shrink and wither into a mere sham. Such, indeed, is the religion of the bulk of professing Christians. The reason is, that they feed on words and shows, and so are thin, poor, pining creatures, unhappy in themselves and of no service to either God or man. And if Theophilanthropy was saved from so sad a condition in its decline, it was because it was not a stereotyped system, had some latitude of movement, and was held at least by no few persons distinguished as much for vigour of intellect as earnestness of character.

JOHN R. BEARD.

III.—THE RELATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT MESSIAH TO HIS JEWISH PROTOTYPE.—IV.

(*e.*) QUOTATIONS in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

(Heb. i. 5—7.)

These quotations are from Psalm ii. 7; 2 Sam. vii. 14; Deut. xxxii. 43; and Psalm civ. 4. The second psalm, according to its historical sense, refers to a theocratic king, probably to Solomon. Here it is taken in a Messianic sense, as was usual in the time of the apostles. The words are therefore accommodated. When the poet says, "I have constituted thee to-day a theocratic prince by the act of anointing," his words are referred to the eternal generation of the Son by the writer before us. 2 Sam. vii. 14, relates to Solomon alone; it is here adapted to the Messiah. The words taken from Deuteronomy in the Septuagint version have no relation to the Messiah. The Greek of Psalm civ. 4, which is incorrect, is used here. The original Hebrew

says that Jehovah makes the winds his messengers and the lightnings his servants; the Septuagint, that the angels are changed into winds and flames of fire, losing the form of their existence and passing into matter.

(i. 8, 9.)

This is from the 45th psalm, which is an epithalamium or marriage song. Here it is taken as Messianic, an interpretation which it may have had in the time of the apostles. The Hebrew is, "Thy throne is God's (or, a divine) throne for ever and ever;" whereas *God* is taken in the Greek for the vocative in which Messiah is addressed. In any case, the quotation is an example of accommodation.

(i. 10—12.)

This passage is from Psalm cii. 25—27. The original refers to Jehovah, the Creator eternal and unchangeable. Contrary to the historical sense, our author takes the words as addressed to Christ, misled perhaps by κύριε in the LXX., the usual appellation of Christ in the apostolic period. His idea of the Son as the Logos existing from eternity coincides with the adopted sense.

(i. 13.)

This is from the 110th psalm. The sitting of the king at Jehovah's right hand is applied to Christ's exaltation to the glory and sovereignty of the Father. The psalm is understood as a Messianic prophecy. It was commonly interpreted so in the apostolic age, for Peter quotes it in that sense, referring its composition to David, and supposing "my Lord" to mean Jesus. It is not the historical sense; for the writer, by a bold figure, describes David as addressed by Jehovah when the latter rides forth to battle in his war-chariot, telling the king to take his seat by the side of Him whose earthly vicegerent he is.

(ii. 6—8.)

From Psalm viii. 4—6. The writer of the psalm speaks of the dominion over the earth bestowed on man by God. Here the words are applied to Christ's exaltation consequent upon his brief humiliation. An ideal sense is adopted, contrary to the historical one. This was readily suggested by the expression "Son of man," already applied in Daniel to the Messiah, and adopted by Jesus himself. "Man" and

"the Son of man" do not mean *man* generally or *redeemed mankind*, but Christ alone in our author's view.

(ii. 12, 13.)

Here are three proofs from Scripture of the sentiment that Christ is not ashamed to call the redeemed his brethren, from Psalm xxii. 22, and Isaiah viii. 17, 18. Though the author of the psalm refers to himself and his condition, the writer of our Epistle assumes that Christ is the speaker in it. He takes it in a Messianic, contrary to its historical, sense. The expressions borrowed from Isaiah, where they allude to the prophet and his children, are interpreted as those of Messiah shewing a feeling of dependence on God characteristic of the human state. The entire passage is an instance of accommodation.

(iii. 7—11.)

This quotation is from Psalm xcv. 7—11, and is a parallel illustration. The words of the Old Testament serve to enforce the writer's emphatic warning.

(iv. 3, 4, 7.)

The object of these quotations is to shew that entrance into the rest of God, which is the ultimate object of a pious life, is not yet attained. It was already spoken of at creation, but the Jews never enjoyed it either under Joshua or David. It is future.

(v. 6.)

From Psalm cx. 4, taken as Messianic. The writer draws a parallel between Christ and Melchizedek, allegorizing the latter's name and historical manifestation.

(viii. 8, &c.)

To confirm his assertion that the old covenant was not faultless, and was therefore to be superseded by another, the writer quotes from Jeremiah xxxi. 31—34, language implying that God did not regard that economy as permanent and complete.

(x. 5—7.)

These words are from Psalm xl. 6—8. The author, explaining the psalm as Messianic, assumes Christ to be the speaker in it. The true historical sense is not the Messianic. Doubtless, the psalm seemed peculiarly suitable to the author's argument, in consequence of the words, "a body

hast thou prepared me," which, however, are either an incorrect translation of the present Hebrew text, or may possibly be a corruption for "ears hast thou prepared me." The proof taken from the psalm rests on a precarious basis. It is incorrect to say that the apostle's argument would be incomplete if the words, "a body hast thou prepared me," were expunged; because Christ's coming to do the will of God implies the assumption of a body. The Son of God must appear in human form to obey for man. The use of the word "body" in the 10th verse, shews that the clause is an important one in the writer's view.

(x. 30.)

The first of these quotations is from Deut. xxxii. 35; the second, from Deut. xxxii. 36, or Psalm cxxxv. 14. The writer establishes his threatening by the punitive justice of God, as attested in Scripture. His citations are pertinent.

(x. 37, 38.)

This is from Habakkuk ii. 3, 4. The original speaks of the sure coming of the prophecy respecting the destruction of the Chaldeans. The LXX. translate incorrectly, applying the coming to God or the Messiah. Yet our author follows their version, and even prefixes the article to the participle, to make it definite respecting Messiah. The clauses of Hab. ii. 4, are transposed. "My just one," says God, "shall live by faith," i.e. by firm trust in God's promises; "but if he draw back, my soul has no pleasure in him," which is an erroneous rendering of the LXX., since the Hebrew runs, "His soul, puffed up, is not upright in him," viz. the Chaldean. Thus the passage is turned aside from its genuine sense.

(xii. 5, 6.)

This passage is quoted from Prov. iii. 11, 12, according to its genuine sense. The words of the wise man to his reader are taken for those of God addressed to believers.

(xii. 26.)

This citation is from Haggai ii. 6, but the Septuagint is not followed closely. "Yet once" is a mistranslation for "yet a little while." The prophet predicts remarkable phenomena in nature, in consequence of which the nations should bring riches to the temple; the author of the Epistle

speaks of the shaking of earth and heaven ushering in the destruction of Jerusalem.

In xiii. 5, 6, the author enforces his own sentiments in the words of the Old Testament (Deut. xxxi. 6; Joshua i. 5; Psalm cxviii. 6), taking God to be the speaker where He is not.

The method of applying the Old Testament adopted by the author of this Epistle is arbitrary. The adaptations of passages are more forced than those of Paul, more subtle, more fanciful, with less semblance of probability. They are not founded on objective truth to the same extent as the Pauline. This may arise from his Alexandrian birth and education, as well as from the influence of Philo's writings. Ignorant as he was of the original Hebrew and dependent on the Greek version, he could not, like Paul, resort to the former when the latter was unsuitable. We are not surprised, therefore, to find him forsaking the historical sense and allegorizing extensively. He introduces the greater part of the new dispensation into the old, discovering shadows and prefigurations in smaller matters than any other New Testament writer has ventured to do. In two notable examples (ch. i. 6, 10) he applies passages in proof of his ideas in a very strange way, making them Messianic. This irregular use of the Old Testament cannot be explained, with Tholuck, by the partly rhetorical and partly homiletic character of the Epistle; *doctrine* is the main topic in the parts where citations commonly appear. It arises from the author's mental idiosyncrasy and the influences that moulded the Alexandrian Jew. In any case, his hermeneutical deficiencies are striking. He used the Jewish canon not merely as a substratum for his ideas, which is legitimate, but as a book whose grammatical sense is altogether subordinate to recondite meanings never intended by the authors. Though the interpretations of Paul are often ideal, their idealism rests on some coincidence between the Old and New Testaments in relation to the things spoken of; the ideal expositions of the Jewish Christian from whom the Epistle to the Hebrews proceeded, are thin and shadowy. His Midrashim are peculiar.

4. The application which the New Testament writers make of passages in the Old. does not supply a hermeneutical standard. They were not infallible. The miracles they

are said to have wrought did not even make them authoritative interpreters of prophecy. They were Jews; and even before their day, their countrymen had begun to find hidden senses in the words of the Bible. They allegorized its narratives. Ingenious, speculative, acute, they discovered a meaning beyond that which is patent to the reader. This method was followed more extensively by the Alexandrian than the Palestinian Jews, because the former were brought under the influence of the Platonic philosophy and imbibed a taste for Greek culture. But Alexandrian acted upon Palestinian exegesis to some extent, and tended so far to cherish a taste for fanciful meanings. The Midrashim or allegorical glosses of the Jews account in part for the manner in which the New Testament applies the Old. The results of their Judaic education and modes of thought were not laid aside after they embraced Christianity; for that would imply a mental revolution alike unphilosophical and uncommon. As Jewish Christians, the leaven of their ordinary exegesis adhered to them. Having become disciples of Christ, they found much in the Old Testament which appeared to foreshadow the New. Tracing divine purposes directly and throughout in the history of their race, having a pragmatic philosophy which knew nothing of second causes or the immutable laws of nature, the new events introducing another religion were readily viewed as included in the former one. This apprehension of Judaism was the more natural because the first phase of Christianity was little more than a reformed Judaism. The connection between it and the old religion involved a participation in essential principles. If the predetermined counsels of Jehovah were conspicuous in the one, they must also be conspicuous in the other. If a divine plan pervaded the one, it pervaded the other. It was this pragmatism which led the New Testament writers to perceive foreshadows and types of the new economy in the old, moulding their interpretations of all the remarkable occurrences; so that divinely arranged coincidences multiplied, and ulterior meanings, the offspring of fancy, bore a character of sacredness from being included in the predetermined harmony.

These observations shew that the hypothesis of a double sense in prophecy has some ground to rest on. The way in which many quotations are explained in the New Testa-

ment seems to justify it. A different sense is often given to the Old Testament from that which is natural and obvious. The advocates of a twofold meaning have evangelists and apostles on their side.

Those who reject a double sense while holding the infallibility of the New Testament writers, adopt one or other of two expedients. They either insist on the fact that apostles and evangelists in their quotations give the true sense intended by the original authors; or that their interpretation is an accommodated one, in other words, that it is not intended to express the one sense of the passage quoted, but to be an apt illustration or enforcement of a particular statement. A passage in Old Testament history, or the language of an ancient prophet, is merely adapted to another thing because similar or susceptible of a like description.

The former class of expositors undertake an impossible thing when they attempt to explain quotations on the principle that the ancient prophets foretold the time of the Saviour's coming, his birth, his office, his death, resurrection and ascension, the Christian church and its triumphs. In making the 16th psalm, for example, relate solely to Christ in his passion, and victory over death and the grave, including his subsequent exaltation to the right hand of God, because of Peter's and Paul's citations in the Acts of the Apostles, Mr. Stuart refers the fourth verse to Christ's detestation of idolatry, his abhorrence of the heathen and their worship. But who does not see its unsuitableness in the lips of the Redeemer shortly before he suffered?

> Their sorrows are many who exchange him for another [God];
> I offer not their libations of blood,
> Nor take their names upon my lips.

Here the speaker contrasts the portion of such as have chosen other deities instead of the true God, and the sorrows they entail, with the goodly heritage he has obtained. Another example of the inextricable difficulty in which these interpreters are involved, may be seen in Hengstenberg's explanation of Isaiah vii. 14, &c., where he assumes a prophecy relating to Christ alone. Forced interpretations must inevitably result from every attempt to crush the originals of such passages as Matthew xxvi. 31, xxvii. 9, 10, into the one sense given them by the evangelist.

Again, though the advocates of rhetorical accommodation take great pains to shew that such expressions as, "Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken," &c., are rightly applied by the New Testament writers to other circumstances than those meant by the old authors, arguing that the sole idea conveyed is, that a fact truly corresponds to the citation, or that it is as applicable to a latter event as to a former of which it was originally spoken, they fail to prove their point. The strong formula just given refuses to admit the principle, notwithstanding the arguments of Sykes, Palfrey and others. For the particle *ἵνα* everywhere indicates *design*; and no parallel from Greek, Latin, or even Rabbinic authors, has been adduced. Even where the expression, "this was fulfilled," is employed, it is likely that the author meant more than mere correspondence or parallelism of illustration, as in Matthew ii. 16—18. Does the language, "Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying," signify nothing but this, "The sharp and comfortless distress of bereaved mothers at Bethlehem at this time, might be well described in language used anciently by Jeremiah, when he was speaking of the desolation of Ramah and Ephraim"? We believe that it conveyed more to the evangelist, who saw a pre-established connection between the two events, a divine arrangement of circumstances by which the one foreshadowed and typified the other; God having so disposed the former history that it should find its consummation in the latter. Such was the general belief of the New Testament writers in their use of the term *fulfilled*. The same opinion underlies their quotations in instances where the formula is not used. Their ideas of the pragmatism of Jewish history and prophecy controlled the method of their citation. If our observations be correct, the number of passages in which the principle of rhetorical accommodation appears, should be carefully limited. We are persuaded that it has been applied in too many instances.

It cannot be denied that the majority of passages quoted in the New Testament from the Old, relating to the person and life of Christ, as well as to the nature of his reign, exemplify the principle of *accommodation proper*, i.e. they contain spiritual or typical senses other than the grammatical; or explain as prophecies what were not intended

to be such. In some cases it is difficult to determine whether the New Testament authors allegorized a passage, or took it for a direct prophecy; whether they adopted a typical sense in addition to the primary, or supposed their own meaning to be the only one. But it is clear that they found types where there are none; and took events to prefigure others, in the exercise of their own judgment. Their allegorical explanations are often arbitrary. What then? Were they wrong in finding their Messiah and his work foreshadowed in the Old Testament? No. *In a certain sense*, Jesus Christ *was* foreshadowed there. They did not see, however, all the difference existing between him and the Jewish Messiah when they wrote. Hence their citations are more frequent than they would otherwise have been. Hence, too, the accommodations to which they resorted, since it was necessary to adapt the Jewish Scriptures to their views by unhistorical interpretation. There is reason to believe that they always acted in good faith; that they explained the Old Testament honestly, never supposing that their modes of adapting it were forced, or alien from its genius. But though they had the Spirit of God, which is the spirit of truth, in large measure, our disinclination to accept all their views about the Divine purposes in shaping events to fulfil certain prophecies, in ordaining the lives of pious men under the Jewish economy to be prelibations of the life of Christ, and in making types for the great antitype, does them no injustice. They did not rise entirely above the influences of their age and race. Nor was exegesis of the Jewish Scriptures the chief object of their mission. They were moral and religious teachers of the truths enunciated by the divine Master. As his disciples, working in his spirit and imbued with his principles, they had to unfold the precepts he taught, to proclaim the efficacy of his blood in the regeneration of mankind, and the triumph of his cross over the kingdom of darkness. To point out the correspondences between the old dispensation and the new, and the consummation of prophecies delivered of old, in the primary occurrences of the latter, was a subordinate matter, which they did not treat very successfully. All of them, save Paul and his disciples, with the author of the fourth Gospel, retained semi-Jewish opinions interfering with a perception of the

ultimate emancipation from Judaism involved in Christ's religion ; but, on the other hand, Paul's rabbinical education induced a dialectic handling of the Scriptures prejudicial to their simplicity. The old prophets speak of a Messiah, not in the way of definite prediction, but of hope, aspiration, longing desire. Their language on the subject is ideal and poetic, indicating neither a settled belief in his person, nor a clear apprehension of his kingdom. Theirs was a floating notion, varying with their idiosyncrasies and the circumstances of their nation. Instead of being an integral part of the national, or even of the prophetic creed, the Messiah of the inspired seers was an ideal personage, and his reign ideal. Patriotic men, in their desire for a spiritual Israel fulfilling the high destinies for which Jehovah seemed to have chosen her, projected a golden age realizing all they hoped for, with a righteous king, far superior to his great ancestor, reigning in peace over a comprehensive theocracy. The first sentence of Bishop Chandler's elaborate defence of Christianity from the prophecies, viz., that "the coming of the Messias was always esteemed a fundamental article of the Jewish faith," is contrary to fact.

The Messiah of the prophets does not correspond to the Jesus of the Gospels. The one was an earthly ruler ; the other is the King of truth, the light and life of mankind, reigning in the hearts of men by his spirit, and subduing them by the power of love. His temple is not in Jerusalem, his subjects not Israel alone after the flesh, or the converted heathen incorporated with Israel ; his temple is the human heart, all mankind his children by faith. He is the express image of the Father's person ; the ideal in whom the Unseen is realized and manifested to the world. He is therefore King of kings and Lord of lords.

While the prophets utter no *definite* prediction of Messiah, still less do they foreshew Jesus Christ. The Old Testament contains no prophecies which strictly, literally and directly predict the person, advent, office and kingdom of the latter. This proposition may appear startling at first ; but it will bear examination. The opposite was once asserted against Collins and others. Bishop Chandler is perhaps the ablest champion of the tenet that there are prophecies which *literally* predict the coming of Christ ; and his select examples are reproduced by Bishop Marsh.

They are Malachi iii. 1, iv. 5, 6; Haggai ii. 6—9; Zechariah ix. 9, xii. 10; Daniel ii. 44, vii. 13, 14, ix. 24—27; Micah v. 2; Habakkuk ii. 3, 4; Amos ix. 11, 12; Isaiah liii., ix. 6. Several of these we have explained already. Not one refers to Christ; but most, not all, are Messianic. Haggai ii. 6—9 is assumed by interpreters to mean that the greater glory of the second temple could have been no other than that which it derived from the Saviour's advent. The passage, however, is not Messianic; neither are two temples, the first and the second, contrasted. To encourage the rebuilding of the temple, the prophet speaks of a great commotion among the nations, leading the selectest and richest of them to come with costly gifts of gold and silver to the new temple, so that its later would far exceed its early glory. But his ideal hopes were not fulfilled. The early state of the temple, which is spoken of as one throughout, continued to be more glorious than the later. Christ did not honour the second temple with his presence, but the third, if we count the successive erections as separate buildings.

With relation to Zechariah ix. 9, which is Messianic, Bishop Marsh asks of whom, but of Jesus Christ, can it be said that he is both just and having *salvation;* not perceiving that an ideal king is described; and that the word rendered "having salvation" is passive, *saved* or *helped* in distress; always delivered by Jehovah, and therefore always victorious.

The poetical language in Daniel ii. 44, 45, and vii. 13, 14, should not be taken as prose, as is done by many expositors. The former passage describes the Messianic kingdom; the latter refers to the Messiah himself.

It is a common remark that Christianity is founded on Judaism. Let us see how far this is correct.

The idea of the kingdom of God, or the theocracy, penetrated and filled the consciousness of the Israelites. The nation had a conviction that it was God's elect; a conviction not merely spiritual and moral, but political in its nature. This idea lay at the basis of Judaism, and gave rise to the Messianic one. When Israel seemed not to realize the theocratic ideal, and her kings were far from being Jehovah's visible representatives, the conception attached itself to a hoped-for future. A Davidic monarch to come became the realization of the theocratic idea.

In announcing himself as the Messiah, Jesus stood on Old Testament ground. Assuming that he was both the final object and personal subject of the revelations of that God who manifested Himself in the ancient economy, he transferred the essence of the religious consciousness of the Israelites to the minds of his disciples. In this aspect, a part of the doctrines which distinguish Christianity from paganism, not from biblical Judaism, is deducible from faith in Jesus as the Messiah. But Christianity has a specific and new ingredient which does not belong to Judaism. It assumes that Jesus of Nazareth embodies *the absolute principle* of revelation and salvation. The Messianic idea is completed and perfected in him. The Old Testament contains nothing more than a preparation for the true kingdom of God, which was a thing hoped for. Israel never was a real theocratic people, and had no perfect representative of Jehovah as the theocratic sovereign, not even David. The kingdom of God was an unattained, unrealized conception. Jehovah's revelations were limited by conditions, and their fulfilment merely prospective. But when they culminated in the Son of God, merging their imperfect form in him who is at once their object and subject, the swaddling clothes of Judaism were abandoned. The form of the founder of Christianity emerges, in whom the absolute principle of revelation is embodied.

Those who speak so perfunctorily of Christianity being founded on Judaism should define their meaning. It is partly so based; but it is partly new. The theocratic idea, which is the root-conviction of Judaism, re-appears, it is true, in Christianity; but in a shape which raises it immensely above its predecessor. The Messianic idea also re-appears; how different, it is easy to perceive. The Messianic idea arose out of the theocratic one which filled all the religious consciousness of Israel; it was not an essential element in the latter. In the course of the historical development of the conception of God's kingdom, the notion of a personal Messiah similar to David suggested itself to the prophets' vision. Hence it is scarcely correct, with Nitzsch, to put the theocratic and Messianic ideas together as the common bases of Judaism and Christianity.* The

* Grundriss der christlichen Dogmengeschichte, p. 18, § 6.

one is an offshoot of the other, important, it is true, in itself; pre-eminently so from its adoption by Jesus of Nazareth, who implanted it in the heart of his disciples with a profound significance unknown to Judaism. In fulfilling the prophetic hopes, he did not undertake or pretend to embody them literally, knowing that they were to a great extent visionary and impracticable. The Christianity which he created was a spiritual Judaism. The later Pauline phase shews a separation from the old religion, where Christianity stands on an independent footing. The remark is true, if it imply that Christianity, in its beginning, was founded on Judaism. It is not true, if it mean that "the whole credit and authority of the Christian religion rests and depends upon Jesus being the Messiah of the Jews," as Mr. English alleges, understanding developed Christianity.* Had a belief in the Messiah to come been an integral part of the oral or written law, an essential article in the Jewish creed; had the prophets *predicted* a great deliverer and sovereign in uniform features and colours; had they described the introduction and progress of his reign in consistent outline,—it might have been plausibly contended that the foundation of Christianity must be laid upon the prophets; but while they indulged in little more than ideal hopes of a great restorer of their race, the importance of their Messiah dwindles into comparative insignificance. A mass of fallacious reasoning has been accumulated on the assumption of the prophetic Messiah being a distinct person clearly predicted and described, with the national belief in him being a fixed principle. Neither is correct. Hence it is inconclusive to argue against the truth of Christianity from the disagreement of Jesus's character with that of the prophetic Messiah. What though he did not correspond with the expected monarch? Jesus did not pretend to be the very Messiah of Jewish hope, the mighty ruler to whom Israel should be gathered, and by whom they should be established in their own land for ever. He did not undertake to deliver Israel from all oppression, and reign over them on an earth changed to a universal paradise. He did not assume the task which the

---

* See Grounds of Christianity examined by comparing the New Testament with the Old, p. 6 of the London reprint.

prophets assigned to the Messiah, of making the Old Testament theocracy the religion of the world, and Jerusalem the metropolis for all nations. He did not take up the Messianic idea, which was a growth in his mind, in the prevailing acceptation. Discerning a germ of truth in its outer shell, he separated it from commingled grossness. His Messiahship was not announced till towards the close of his ministry; but he was conscious from the first of its antagonism to the popular notion; though the conviction that he was to fulfil it in a higher sense, was probably the result of ripening experience and mental development. The un-Jewish, un-Davidic, spiritual nature he gave it, brought him into conflict with the hierarchy, and exposed him to serious misapprehension even on the part of his disciples. In adopting the idea of Pharisaic Judaism, he elevated, purified, changed it. The political part he allowed to drop, or dissolved it away by spiritualizing and widening the conception of "the people of God," to make it ethically universal. The predicates, "Son of God," "king," he took in a mystic-theocratic sense, not a metaphysical one. In his consciousness, the ethical character of the Messianic idea was its main feature; the destruction of evil, the fear of God, purity of soul, the prevalence of righteousness effected by the sword of the word, he employs as "prince of peace." This was perfectly legitimate; nay more, it was most desirable. The divine man shewed a perfection of wisdom in transforming the notion as he did, and making it the possession of humanity, the unspeakable gift centred in himself.

These observations shew that the arguments in such books as Isaac ben Abraham's *Chizzook Emunah* and English's "Grounds of Christianity examined by comparing the New Testament with the Old," rest on sand. Thus when ben Abraham sums up one of his chapters with the five points discussed in it, viz. 1. In the days of the Messiah will take place the gathering of Judah and Ephraim, that is, of all Israel; 2. Many nations will join Israel as the people of the Lord; 3. Gog and Magog, that is, the powers opposing Israel, will be overthrown; 4. Undisturbed peace will then reign throughout the world; 5. The king Messiah will have dominion over all the world; and then asserts that not one of these events occurred in the days of

Jesus, but rather the reverse, he metamorphoses the prophetic delineations into real, definite, significant *predictions.** Ideal sketches, the aspirations and hopes of seers glancing into the future without a clear knowledge of it, are transformed into something very different. The ablest Jews themselves, perceiving the true character of prophetic forebodings, have abandoned belief in a Messiah to come, counting it folly to expect *such* a personage as is sketched by the prophets, a potentate whose attributes do not reach the highest excellence.

Christianity does not rest on the exact correspondence of Jesus and his work with the hyperbolical description of the Messiah given in the Hebrew prophets. Its truth does not "depend on ancient revelations which are contained in the Old Testament, and more particularly and immediately on the revelations made to the Jews therein," as Collins asserts. The assumed *predictions* of prophets, whose fulfilment he takes to be the conclusive proof that the Christian religion is true, do not exist; and if they did, no external evidence, not even that of miracles, possesses the validity of the internal. When, therefore, we find Sherlock asserting that "the argument from prophecy becomes necessary to establish the claim of the gospel; and as truth is consistent with itself, so this claim must be true, or it destroys all others," his ideas of prophecy and its evidence expose Christianity to serious attack. He misapprehends the nature of the argument. Christianity depends on the person and teachings of Jesus Christ as they are in themselves. The best evidence of its divine origin is its spiritual ethics, its far-reaching purity, its adaptation to the deepest wants of man, its ability to satisfy the cravings of the immortal soul.

When Jesus claimed to be the Messiah, *an exact correspondence* between him and the prophetic delineations could not be expected because of their fanciful and varying pictures. Ancient gropings after a Messiah were imperfect, and tinged with carnal Judaism. They figured one who did not rise much above the type of a magnified David. Jesus embodied the Messianic conception in a form surpassing the flights of Jewish fancy; the dim foreshadows

---

* See Faith Strengthened, translated by Moses Mocatta, p. 180.

of a coming One melted into a picture of perfect light. The hopes of seers were fulfilled in a higher, holier sense than imagination had conceived. They were ennobled by the man of sorrows, instead of being debased by a personage corresponding to the projected temporal prince. The Jewish empire, established on a more glorious footing than the old, and administered by the Davidic Messiah under heavenly protection, is a poor kingdom compared with "the kingdom of heaven," composed of a community of humble, meek and merciful men, pure in heart, lovers of peace, disciplined by trial, hungering and thirsting after righteousness.

From these observations it will appear, that the theologians who write about "the witness of the Old Testament to Christ" take an incorrect view of the subject. The Old Testament presents Messianic prophecies describing an ideal king; *it does not predict or speak of Jesus Christ.* Some may think this an incorrect statement in the face of the 24th chapter of Luke's Gospel, where the risen Saviour proves to the eleven disciples assembled in Jerusalem on the evening of the first day of the week, that in his sufferings, death and resurrection, the promises of Moses, of the Prophets and the Psalms, were fulfilled (ver. 44); as well as of John v. 46, where Jesus says, "Moses wrote of me." Yet it is perfectly consistent with our view of both passages. With the former, because the tradition incorporated in the 24th chapter of the third Gospel is a later one than that of the first and second Gospels respecting the glorification of Jesus, having its own difficulties as they have theirs. Originating in a desire to satisfy intellectual doubts about the corporeal reality of the risen one, it attempts to dissipate them very imperfectly. All probability is against the alleged utterance of the words attributed to Christ there; or his meeting the disciples at the place and time specified. Our statement is also consistent with John v. 46, because the speeches of Jesus in the fourth Gospel cannot be taken as generally authentic. That Gospel affords little help in ascertaining what Jesus really said.

The Messiah of the Jews was not the Jesus of the Gospels, though the apostles and evangelists were desirous to press a resemblance between them. In contending with unbelieving Judaism, they felt an apologetic necessity to

accumulate proof that the theocratic restoration of David's kingdom which the Jews hoped for was vain; and that all Israel had to expect was fulfilled in the person of Jesus. Penetrated with the belief that the promises of the Old Testament were fulfilled in him, they used the sources from which they compiled with that view. Matthew's Gospel is the most conspicuous example of this tendency. The Jesus of the Gospels, a transformed, exalted, nobler embodiment of Messianic hopes, is the substance before which the dim and ill-defined shadow projected in the Old Testament shrinks away.* To *urge* a likeness between the type and antitype, serves to shew their discrepancy.

Mr. English, following in the wake of R. Isaac, has made severe remarks on the New Testament writers for the way in which they quote the Hebrew Scriptures, alleging that they give allegorical senses never intended by the prophets, neglect the context, distort, add to and abridge their words. His reasoning is one-sided. Jews and their sympathizers, in attacking Christianity should remember, that the New Testament authors commonly quoted the Greek version, which is a Jewish work that deals very freely with the Hebrew text, often departing from and altering it. They should remember that the very practice reprehended so harshly is due to the fact that apostles and evangelists were Jews, whose education shaped their interpretations and citations. They should recollect, too, the case of Surenhusius and the learned rabbi whom he consulted on the best way of vindicating the passages of the Old Testament which are quoted in the New. Did not the Jew advise the Christian to peruse the Talmud, with the allegorical and literal commentaries of the most ancient Jewish writers, to observe their several ways of quoting and interpreting Scripture, to collect as many materials of that kind as would be sufficient for the purpose, and so to justify all the citations made from the Old Testament in the New? Surenhusius's collection goes far to verify the remark, that the apostles and evangelists did no more than Jewish commentators and critics were accustomed to. Should it be said that the materials digested by the Amsterdam Professor are of later origin than

---

* Semler calls the Messiah of the Old Testament, "individuum vagum den sich ein jeder anders gedacht."

the New Testament, and do not prove a similar method of exposition in the first century of our era, some abatement ought certainly to be made on that score; though the Jews have ever been anxious to push back into prior ages many portions of the Talmud. But after all reasonable deduction, the fact remains that Philo and the Alexandrians allegorized as much as any New Testament writer; and that Palestinian exegesis, even in the first century, was not free from applications of the Hebrew Scriptures parallel to those of the Christian authors, or, rather, more arbitrary and mystic.

It is often asserted that the prophets sketched out the great future of religion, distinctly foretelling events in the gospel history and times. This is a precarious argument, demanding better evidence than any usually adduced. We admit that the utterances of seers and poets often suit Christian times, and are so applied by expositors, if not in a primary, at least in a secondary sense. But this is *adaptation*, not exegesis. Inspired prophets, carried away on the wings of imagination, sometimes furnish ideal pictures which are best fulfilled in the Christian church. Unconsciously to themselves, they appear like instruments in the Spirit's hand, giving forth utterances which can only be verified in a dispensation different from their own. The proposition that they predict future events belonging to gospel times cannot be sustained. Their indistinct gropings may strikingly correspond to certain phenomena, but were not divinely intended to foreshadow them.

The interpretation which assumes that definite events in the far distant future are foretold in the Old Testament always needs sifting. Recommended in Bishop Newton's popular but superficial work, it has lingered too long in the minds of the many, though exploded among the best expositors. No attempt to revive it can succeed. Apologists may try to reanimate the dead theory, but it falls to pieces in their hands. Thus when Balaam says that "ships shall come from the coast of Chittim, and shall afflict Asshur and shall afflict Eber, and he also shall perish for ever," some refer the words to the cessation of the temporal dominion and polity of the Hebrews, like the dominion of the Seleucidæ, who were the rulers of Asshur at the time alluded to. This is incorrect. "He also shall perish," means Asshur, not the Hebrews. Proud Assyria, the conqueror of Meso-

potamia, was hastening to destruction even at the time of Sennacherib, when these words were put into the mouth of Balaam. Neither is the fall of Jerusalem under the Romans, and the subsequent dispersion of the Jews, foretold by Moses in Deuteronomy (xxviii.) and Leviticus (xxvi. 33); the Assyrian captivity is meant there. The part of Leviticus in question belongs to the Jehovist; and the late date of Deuteronomy is well established.

SAMUEL DAVIDSON.

IV.—BISHOP HAMPDEN.

Some Memorials of Renn Dickson Hampden, Bishop of Hereford. Edited by his Daughter, Henrietta Hampden. London: Longmans. 1871.

A FEW years hence, probably, the life of Dr. Hampden will be much more widely regarded than it is now as an instance of arrested growth. If we look at his career as a whole, we can scarcely say that its later phases altogether harmonize or tally with the earlier. Without imputing to him the least insincerity (and there is no doubt that hypocrisy in any shape is the last fault which can be laid to his charge), we can scarcely think of him without the feeling that the complexion of his closing years is not precisely that which the tenor of his early life would have led us to expect.

It will not be denied that the minds by which the theological thought of Oxford, and through it of England, in the present century has been most influenced, are those of Copleston, Whately, Newman, Pusey, Arnold, Hinds and Hampden, or that every one of these men felt to a certain extent the pressure of those intellectual or spiritual forces which have brought about the development of that modern liberalism, of which we have not yet seen the issue. But the career of all the rest is far more rounded off, and exhibits far more of logical completeness, than that of Hampden. Starting from the point of an ultra-Protestantism, Dr. Newman could perfectly appreciate the notion of resistance to

authority, as such, and could thus see his way to that idea of liberalism of which for a time Dr. Pusey shewed himself as something very like the avowed champion. For Dr. Newman, the gradual advance from his first position to the principle of absolute submission was as necessary and inevitable as it afterwards became to Frederick William Faber; and the principle so embraced was carried out determinately and without hesitation to its extreme logical results. With Dr. Pusey also the recoil was not long in coming; but, although he professed now to regard with horror historical doubts which in his treatise on German Rationalism he had held to be perfectly justifiable, he still retained so much of individual freedom or obstinacy of judgment as to devise a theory of Catholicity by means of which he could with a safe conscience continue to take his own course. Here, however, as in Dr. Newman's case, there was nothing more to be looked for. Between the conclusions of both these leaders of the Oxford movement there was little difference beyond that of form. The influence of Copleston was chiefly felt by the younger generation in which Whately stands out as his most prominent disciple. Whately's intellectual life presents an image of complete and self-sufficing satisfaction. Doubtless the foundations of faith were to be laid in reason, or the results of faith were not to be inconsistent with reason. Doubtless all men were to be convinced, not dragooned into belief. Doubtless those who did not believe were not to be addressed as spiritual outcasts, or as brands fitted only for the burning. But beneath all this remained the assurance that Dr. Whately's creed and conclusions were absolutely right, and that, though different opinions were certainly to be tolerated, yet those who took a different view of Christianity, or of its leading doctrines, its system and organization, from that of Dr. Whately, were persons of shallow apprehension or perverted judgment,—in short, fools. But here, again, we have the same rounding off of the whole life; or rather we have more. Whately is the Aristotelian *αὐτάρκης*, and he stands by himself or in his own secret consciousness *τετράγωνος ἄνευ ψόγου*. Of Arnold it would perhaps be rash to say what the later phases of his life would have been, had his career been prolonged. With a thorough hatred of all unreality, and sincerely believing himself to be fighting unreservedly for

genuine freedom of inquiry and expression, he yet had clinging about him certain dogmatic convictions which he insisted on identifying with Christian faith, and which might in the end have led him to conclusions justifying or demanding something more than merely a "modified theory of persecution." Of Bishop Hinds alone can it be said that the liberalism which became stereotyped or petrified at a certain stage in Whately, has not been stunted or arbitrarily crushed,—that he alone has lived to maintain the uselessness of all tests or restrictions, articles and subscriptions,—to regard clergy and laity alike as all learners in the great school of the world, and to look on all dogmas as on materials which further thought and wider knowledge may render it needful hereafter to mould into a different shape. Of him alone can it be said that he had a definite point of departure from the opinions of predominant parties, and that from this point he has advanced fearlessly in search of the truth of facts, without regard to consequences or any secondary considerations. And of Dr. Hampden alone can it be said that, having seemingly laid down his glove in a defiance which looked like a challenge to mortal combat, he failed to appear in that part of the lists where his presence was naturally looked for,—that, having declared his quarrel, he denied the obligation of fighting it out,—that, though there might be a great cry, there was little wool.

Yet Dr. Hampden's sincerity remains beyond question; and it is unfair and probably unjust to regard his opponents as necessarily insincere. In all likelihood, with many, the conviction of the pernicious character and tendency of his views was probably as genuine as Dr. Hampden's conviction of his innocence; and it is this very sincerity of the persecutor and the persecuted which should read us the most instructive lesson. Few also, it may be, will be tempted to deny that the range of Hampden's reading was wider than that of almost all other men of his generation at Oxford, and that it ran in the direction of the scholastic philosophy before the tide began to turn strongly towards the more ancient patristic literature. But Hampden approached this philosophy with the predispositions and honest convictions bred in him by early training and association; and a conflict on the field of the scholastic terminology became inevitable. It was impossible that this

terminology could be accepted by him without a struggle. In so far as his belief in Christ was a real and honest belief in a love which embraced all mankind, and in a Divine Spirit whose workings were not to be repressed within the walls of a system, a theology drawn out by means of a technical nomenclature could not fail at first sight to be repulsive. He might, after a resistance of whatever length, own himself vanquished; and then he would fall at once into the ranks of ordinary traditionalists, or might drift away into the great ocean of Papal obedience. Or he might see that the prevalent beliefs of his own day were either the results of, or were in great part shaped by, an array of terms similar in nature to, if not identical with, those of the schoolmen; and then he would at once arrive at the conclusion that in this theological terminology lay the root of the evil. That the comprehension of a scheme or system which has given rise to endless differences of opinion, and to form anything like a complete idea of which needs a keen and practised intellect, should be demanded by God, either as a condition of church communion or as essential to salvation, was a proposition intrinsically incredible; and if it be untrue, then clearly no proposition could be more mischievous; and the duty of all true Christians would be to rise up and do their best to root out the canker which must in the end eat away all Christian life. Such, accordingly, we find Hampden's conviction to have been at starting; such, doubtless, he supposed that it remained through life. The disease is described in terms of unequivocal clearness. The "speculative logical Christianity which survives among us at this day," "has been," he asserts, "the principal obstacle to the union and peace of the Church of Christ." The whole process, which has had for its result "that vast apparatus of technical terms which Christian theology now exhibits," was radically wrong and vicious. "It will appear that, whilst theologians of the schools have thought they were establishing religious truth by elaborate argumentation, they have been only multiplying and arranging a theological language." Nay, even this is not the end of the mischief. "Experience tells us that it has not rested here. The signs have been converted into things; the combination and analysis of words which the logical theology has produced, have given occasion to the

passions of men to arm themselves in defence of the phantoms thus called into being."* In short, logical theology has wrought nothing but harm; and it would have been far better for Christendom and the world if there had never been any logical theology at all. There could be little doubt that words such as these were as the sound of a trumpet summoning men to mortal battle; and as little can we doubt that in such a struggle Dr. Arnold believed himself to be engaged by the side of his friend. "Your view of the difference between Christian Truth and Theological Opinion," he writes to Hampden, "is one which I have long cherished, and which I fondly look to as the means, under God, of bringing the Church of Christ to the only unity that is at once practicable and desirable,—that only unity which Christ and Christ's apostles ever designed for it."† And again: "With what you say of the evils of a technical and theoretical theology, I agree most fully. I understand you to mean . . . that the Scripture is to be used for lessons more than for truths; that morally, and as far as our own feelings and conduct are concerned, we may make deductions from Scripture with perfect safety; but that an abstract deduction drawn from language, which, when speaking of the Divine Being, must be the language of accommodation, is generally unwarranted and must be often absurd. This I hold to be so true, that the contrary system has been the worst corruption of Christianity, next to the system of priestcraft, which the world has ever seen; it has turned away our eyes from the bread of life, while it has beguiled us with a stone."‡

It is impossible to mistake the drift and logical issue of such words as these. They resolve themselves into the great problem in the determination of which the battle between theology and religion must be fought out. They imply nothing less than the assertion that religion belongs to the province not of dogmas but of faiths, and that faiths, though they may be approved by the intellect, yet do not come to us through the apprehension of the intellect. In other words, faiths must be for all times and all countries, and we cannot conceive either their modification or their abrogation. It follows that every proposition which cannot

---

* P. 25. † P. 37. ‡ P. 63.

be reduced into this permanent form is a dogma, which may possibly or probably be true, but which ought not to be laid down as the basis either of religious life or of Christian communion. If we cannot conceive of any time or place in which the proposition that God is good can cease to be true or undergo the least modification, then the goodness of God is a faith on which we may feed, and from which every child of man must draw abundant and unfailing nourishment. It is a faith which will teach him that God, being good, must love all his creatures, and that, as He desires their good, so He will accomplish it; and so on with all the inferences which follow directly from the conviction of his goodness or justice, these being mere synonyms for the same qualities. But if the propositions that God is One in Three and Three in One, or that men are justified by the imputation to them of the righteousness of another, or that they are saved because the punishment due to their sins has been borne by another, stand on a different footing,—if it be the fact that these statements do not commend themselves to the heart and conscience as the statement of the Divine Goodness confessedly does,—if, rather, it be true that some of these propositions are felt more and more to be a burden on thought and to stunt the proper growth of the mind, or, further, appear to be even morally repulsive,—then these propositions, whether true or false, are simply dogmas with which religion in its essence has no necessary concern. It follows, therefore, that nothing can be really a faith unless it be a truth on which all men may live, although it is quite possible that men may fancy that they are living on faiths when they are really starving themselves with husks and straw in the form of propositions which correspond with no fact. It is, further, possible that men who are stunting their spiritual growth in this way, may yet be fully convinced that the process is not wholesome, and may see very clearly the mischief which it may be doing in the societies around them. They may, in fact, be really living on a deeper faith, while they continue to profess their adherence to certain propositions which may be purely dogmatic or technical, and they may protest against the evils of a scientific theology with the vehemence and fervour of a righteous conviction. In other words, they have got hold of a truth which may be mighty to the

pulling down of strongholds ; they are wielding a weapon which is the sword of the Spirit, and all things which feel themselves vulnerable by that weapon are filled with fear accordingly and strive to blunt its edge, while they in whose hands it is may not know how far it may be necessary for them to bear it.

This sketch, so far as it goes, precisely represents the position of Hampden and Arnold. Whether or not they chose to act consistently and thoroughly on their principles, they had committed themselves to the assertion that all intellectual systems of theology may be wrong and certainly are superfluous, and that in particular the scholastic theology had influenced the theology of the present day to an indefinite extent, and purely in the way of evil, and was therefore a thing to be utterly resisted and put down. But what complexion would these assertions assume in the eyes of those who felt convinced that the scholastic terminology and the theology of Athanasius must stand or fall together, and that there were many doctrines which Hampden and Arnold might continue to regard as faiths or living realities, but on which the weapon which they wielded might in the end do summary execution ?

Men may be right or wrong in their acts, but they do not act without motive ; and when large bodies of men shew themselves resolutely bent on a given course of action, it may be fairly assumed that they are animated by a true instinct, if not by a clear intellectual conviction. Can we possibly fail to see that in Hampden's indignant protest against the evils of a technical theological terminology, a most constraining motive was furnished to all who felt that some portion or other of this terminology was essential to the existence of the systems which they sought to uphold ? Can we doubt that here we have the explanation of the movement against the Regius Professor of Divinity and the Bishop-elect of Hereford ?

An attempt has been made by the editor of these Memorials to account for the opposition to or persecution of her father on different grounds. It is scarcely likely that a daughter, writing of one to whom she stands in so close a relation, would be the most competent judge of the motives which called forth the angry antagonism of 1836 ; but she has probably been encouraged by others to assert that

"many causes,—political and personal,—combined on those occasions to swell the numbers and to impart heat and bitterness to the struggle;" and further to state that, nevertheless, "it seems to have been his advocacy of the claims of Dissenters to admission to the University of Oxford that drew down upon him so large a share of unpopularity; and the Bampton Lectures (the ostensible cause, though published years before) were then reviewed with the acrimonious feelings which the views advocated in the pamphlet had excited in the minds of those who most strenuously opposed any less exclusive form of admission to the Universities than the one then existing."*

That this, in few words, is not the true statement of the case, may be taken as proved by the explicit assertions of some who took part in the movement against Hampden. In reply to the Spectator, which had adopted Miss Hampden's version of the story, a "Sexagenarian" who voted against the Professor of Divinity, declares "most solemnly, of his own knowledge," that the facts were different. "We really believed (and I, for one, believe as firmly now as I did then) that the statements in the Bampton Lectures were utterly subversive of Christianity," that is, of Christianity in the sense attached to the term by the "Sexagenarian."† We have no reason for doubting this statement; and it is clearly our business rather to seek for a sufficient motive than to charge men with causeless lying. Whether Mr. Newman, in his pamphlet published in 1836, misrepresented Dr. Hampden's meaning or exaggerated the force of his statements, is a matter of very secondary importance; but apart from this, there can be no question that the maintainers of the Calvinistic doctrine of reprobation might reasonably feel that their own house was endangered when the terminology of the scholastic theologians was assailed. Their neighbour's dwelling was on fire: how should they know that the flames would not extend to their own? Anglicans, of whatever shade, might justly feel the same anxiety, and fail to receive the slightest comfort from Dr. Hampden's assurance that there was not the least cause for alarm.

The history of the next century will in all likelihood shew that Dr. Hampden's opponents were more keen-sighted,

---

* P. vi.

† Spectator, May, 6, 1871, p. 540.

or at the least had a truer instinct, than himself. The traditional orthodoxy, which cannot or will not part from its peculiar phrases, whatever may be the complexion of its creed, had seen the snake in the grass, and it started aside with the terror of the Grand Master in Scott's romance, when the dwarf Nectanebos croaked out the words, "Accipe hoc."

That Dr. Hampden did all that he could, and more perhaps than he ought, to soothe his antagonists and disarm opposition, it is almost superfluous to say. He felt keenly the crushing burden of the terminology of Aquinas; he did not feel the weight of the terminology employed in the Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty-nine Articles; and accordingly he rejected and protested against the one, while, clinging to the other, he further insisted that its dogmatic propositions were based on corresponding realities. Unconscious though he may have been of the fact, his work, so far as the history and growth of English thought in this country are concerned, was already done. Henceforth his task was to shew that the weapon which could deal so trenchant a stroke against mediæval technicalities, was a very blunt and harmless weapon indeed if turned against the theology of the Church of England. From this point, his career may furnish matter for satisfaction to such as look upon dogma as indispensable for the support of Christian life: for those who regard it in its connexion with the growth of the human mind, it loses well-nigh all its interest. Henceforth his great effort seemed to be to prove that he was the enemy of no theological terminology except such as might seem to himself to be dry and barren, and that fortunately most of the dogmas maintained by High-churchmen or Low-churchmen happened not to come into this list. Thus he could assert to the Archbishop of Canterbury (and doubtless with the most perfect honesty), "that a belief in the great revealed truths of the Trinity and the Incarnation" had been his "stay through life," and that he utterly disclaimed "the imputation of inculcating any doctrines at variance with these foundations of Christian hope." To him these dogmas were realities; in other words, he thought that he had reached the ideas which lie at the bottom of them, and he had honestly convinced himself that in these ideas he found wholesome and necessary food. Nor did

he stand alone in his position. Arnold could say with truth, speaking of Hampden in a letter to a friend, "He is engaged in the same battle against technical theological language, to which you and I have, I believe, an equal dislike; while he would join us thoroughly in condemning the errors against which the Articles were directed."* Whether some of their own tenets could or could not be brought under ban as being mere bits of technical theological language, neither ever paused to consider; and Hampden could say calmly that "we are come to this point that we must debate afresh the grounds on which the Reformation was established,"† without perceiving that his method (its truth being for the moment granted) might possibly be carried further than he chose to carry it himself. Such a suspicion manifestly never crossed his mind when he thanked his parishioners of Ewelme for the farewell address in which they say: "You have ever made the great doctrine of Justification by Faith in the imputed righteousness of Jesus Christ a prominent feature in your preaching....You have endeavoured to explain to us the scriptural view of the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, shewing how the Divine as well as human nature must have met in the spotless sacrifice for sin."‡ If Dr. Hampden's declarations elsewhere had left the door open, it might have been urged that the notion of justification by imputed righteousness was just one of those creations of a technical theology against which it was the work of his life to struggle; but he has left no such loophole; and if such had been his conviction, his sense of honesty and truth would at once have led him to warn them earnestly in his reply against being caught in so mischievous a snare. That this doctrine belongs to the region of an artificial theology, is maintained by the vast majority of Christians; and Dr. Newman could speak of it as a modern, private, arbitrary, unscriptural system, which, promising liberty, conspires against it. It is impossible that a statement can be regarded as a matter for faith, in the sense in which we have defined the word, when a writer like Dr. Newman can speak of it as a "strange paradox," which says that "the glory of God's pronouncing us righteous lies in His leaving us unrighteous."§

---

* P. 91. † P. 90. ‡ P. 135.

§ Lectures on Justification, pp. 63, 86. These Lectures, it is scarcely necessary to say, were published long before Dr. Newman left Oxford.

It is not a question of the truth of the doctrine. The very ground of Hampden's quarrel with the scholastic theology was that it made propositions, which might possibly be true, to be of the essence of faith and religion, when really they were not so. The doctrine of reconciliation or atonement by substitution may or may not be true; but it is essentially a tenet which must be derived by intellectual inference and must be embraced by the mind, before the feeling which is supposed to be its necessary accompaniment can be awakened in the heart. But Hampden did not choose to see this; and when he was charged with undermining the foundations of the traditional system, he could "solemnly deny the scandalous imputation." "As an honest man, I say, I do not, and never did for one moment of my life, in thought or word, hold or maintain any other doctrine respecting our Lord's most holy person and His blessed work of Redemption than that which is plainly set forth from Scripture in the Articles and Formularies of our Church. I hold too, and have ever held most firmly, the full doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as stated on the same authority in the same documents of the Church."* The statement deserves implicit belief, in however strange a light it may exhibit his powers of perception. Here are documents, full of a technical theological terminology, which have been pronounced by a large majority of Christendom to be inaccurate, insufficient, or wrong from beginning to end; here is a doctrine which, on the relations of the Third Person of the Trinity to the First and the Second, lays down a proposition which the whole Eastern Church rejects as both unscriptural and false; and yet the great antagonist of technical theological system could embrace them all without the least misgiving.

Regarded from this point of view, the work which he looked upon as especially his own, would seem in his own person to have come utterly to nought; but although it had little effect in modifying his own beliefs, it had a very powerful effect on the mode in which he dealt with the beliefs of others. Firmly as he supposed himself to be persuaded of the truth of the statements contained in the Formularies and Articles of the Church of England, he yet was not so absolutely sure of their indefectibility as to cast

---

* P. 266.

stones at others who had reached a different conclusion. The communion to which he belonged (he told the people of Hereford at a meeting for Education, when first he went among them) he regarded as superior to others, believing that it taught the truth; but "while he said this, he allowed every consideration for the honest scruples of others, assigning to them the same conscientious motives which actuated himself, following as they did the same Scriptures for their guide."* So again, in the letter which conveyed the confession of his faith to Lord John Russell, he said: "Whilst I fully believe that there is but one Catholic Faith, I am not required by this persuasion to treat disrespectfully or uncharitably all that differ from us, or that conscientiously declare that they, for their part, cannot learn that Faith from the Bible."†

Taken along with his belief of the value of theological terminology, such words as these can scarcely be regarded as clashing with the sketch of Hampden's theory by Dr. Newman, who represents him as saying that although "he firmly believes the Church's dogmatic statements concerning the Trinity, &c., and at a proper season would contend as zealously against Arian and Socinian doctrines, as those who think that, in the case of others, belief in them is of importance to eternal salvation;" yet he "will not pronounce heretical opinions (so called) to be dangerous to any being in the world, except to those who do not hold them."‡

That the storms which were aroused by his nomination to the Divinity Professorship and the See of Hereford should be followed by periods of calm, of a somewhat humdrum kind, is, therefore, no matter for surprise. The world had already heard all that Dr. Hampden had to say; and the very honesty of his character made the assurance doubly sure that beliefs, in which he declared himself never to have for a moment faltered, would continue unshaken to the end. It was thus natural that after his consecration little more should be heard of Bishop Hampden beyond the bounds of his diocese. Old friends and scholars were glad to greet again in their new shape the essays which he had contributed to the Encyclopædia Britannica on the Fathers of Greek Philosophy; but if some liberal thinkers hoped that when the fury of

---

* P. 180. † P. 268.

‡ See the Sexagenarian's letter, already referred to, Spectator, May 6, 1871.

the multitude was let loose against the Bishop of Natal, Dr. Hampden would follow the example of Dr. Thirlwall or Dean Stanley, they were doomed to find that Hampden would disappoint them not less than Whately. At a time when plain speaking was more than ever called for from all liberal men, Bishop Hampden could content himself with equivocal platitudes about "the conviction in the minds of the people of this country of the sacred value of the Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testaments,"* and with the direct misstatement that the Bishop of Natal was attempting to disturb that conviction. Thus the man who had declared that he could not judge uncharitably of those who drew from the Scriptures conclusions different from his own, could dismiss the whole work of Bishop Colenso with the remark, that "the question concerned in an examination of the credit due to an alleged history is not one to be decided by the rules of arithmetic."† If he spoke thus, not having read the books, he is beyond most other men without excuse, as his one complaint against his countrymen is, that large numbers of them had condemned him without having looked at a page that he had written. If he had read the books, he must have known that the argument against the genuineness of the old Mosaic and Levitical legislation on the ground that it was never carried out, is at the least not an arithmetical objection.

If it be a defect in a theological guide not to see clearly or even to be blind to the signs of the times, it can scarcely be said that they who intrusted themselves to Dr. Hampden were in safe hands. If there be one thing more than another, the knowledge of which is of vital importance to the adherents of all the traditional systems, it is the precise method and attitude assumed by those who treat those systems and their origin as matters for perfectly impartial and unbiassed analysis. But this Bishop Hampden made no effort to learn. He is content to deal with Strauss and the Tübingen school generally as with men who regard the Old and New Testaments as one long parable or allegory,‡ and to assert emphatically that "it is the fundamental objection to the miraculous, existing in some minds addicted to scientific investigation, that has given rise to their method of Scripture interpretation."§ A greater mistake could scarcely

---

* P. 231. † P. 232. ‡ P. 213. § P. 218.

be made. Strauss may, it is true, reject one by one the several narratives contained in the Gospels; but if he does so, it is chiefly because these narratives are self-contradictory; and beyond all doubt the discussion in this country has passed away from the region of miracle to that of mere historical criticism as such. The real argument now rests on the manifest contradictions, absurdities and impossibilities exhibited by those portions of the Gospel narratives which have nothing whatever to do with miracle—contradictions turning on the secrecy in which the Messiahship is wrapped in the Synoptic Gospels, and the stormy publicity accorded to it throughout the whole ministry in the fourth Gospel,—on the impossibility of reconciling the narratives of the birth and early years of Jesus, in the visit of the magi, the purification, the flight into Egypt, the return to Judæa and Nazareth,—on the contradictory accounts of the relations of John the Baptist to the Messiah, —on the manifest falsehood of such legends as that of the watch kept at the grave of Jesus. The inference is, that narratives which are not trustworthy in the most ordinary matters, are not to be credited when they relate events which impose any heavier tax on our powers of belief. Such is the real attitude of modern criticism and thought towards the history which is claimed as the basis for all the traditional systems of Christendom; and of this momentous change in the conditions of the controversy Dr. Hampden was altogether unaware. It will be to their own hurt if they who opposed Dr. Hampden continue to ignore the real questions at issue, and substitute for them the problems of an age gone by.

But in spite of all drawbacks, and in spite of the neutral tints shed over the whole of his later career, Bishop Hampden did a substantial work in his generation; and his cry for a clearer and purer atmosphere than that of the dominant schools of theology will not have been sent up in vain. Hence these Memorials, slight as they are, must retain a permanent value as illustrating the course and tendencies of English thought during the generations which witnessed the origin and development of the Oxford movement in the nineteenth century.

PRESBYTER ANGLICANUS.

V.—JOHN WESLEY.—II.

The Life and Times of the Rev. John Wesley, M.A., Founder of the Methodists. By the Rev. L. Tyerman. 3 vols. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1871.

John Wesley and the Evangelical Reaction of the Eighteenth Century. By Julia Wedgwood. London: Macmillan and Co. 1870.

John Wesley's Place in Church History determined, with the aid of Facts and Documents unknown to, or unnoticed by, his Biographers. By R. Denny Urlin. Rivingtons: London, Oxford and Cambridge. 1870.

I HAVE lately met with the following description. It seems originally to have formed part of a sermon or lecture, but it will serve my purpose as an introduction to the present paper.

"See that small, active, clerical-looking man, as he rides on horseback, day by day throughout the year, and thus passes, in regular course, time after time, over the length and breadth of the land. When he comes in his journeys to a town or village which he deems suitable for his work, he lifts up his voice, on the green, or in the square, or at the cross, and proclaims the glad tidings with which his heart is charged. Some listen, and some deride. Now the rude multitude is silent and subdued as by an enchanter's spell, and then it rises up to threaten destruction, roaring and tossing like the waves of the sea. But the result is, that the face of the whole population, in its religious aspect, is changed by the efforts of that man. He was no vulgar fanatic, pandering for notoriety. He was a gentleman and a scholar, with aristocratic prejudices, and a fastidious severity of speech. But seeing how those for whom Christ died were everywhere perishing as by moral pestilence and famine, his heart was hot within him, and he went, in defiance of ecclesiastical order, and academical repute, and social custom, and personal taste, and actually took the healing medicine and the vital bread to the very dwellings and chambers of spiritual hunger and disease. That was all he did. In the simplicity of the work lay no small degree of its power; and when we contrast the individual character of the effort with the magnitude of the evil against which it was directed, we feel that thus to trust in that simplicity was to reach to the sublime. Such was John Wesley."

I shall pursue the plan I pursued before, following the course of Mr. Wesley's life, from the point where I last left it, in the way of comment rather than of narrative; but I wish to give, as a kind of background to what I may advance, some general idea of the arduous exertions to which he subjected himself from the time when his societies began to be formed to the time of his death. It is because of its bearing upon these exertions that I have prefaced my remarks by the extract just quoted.

The extent of the labours to which Mr. Wesley subjected himself was perfectly marvellous, and in the case of almost any other man would be pronounced impossible. His was, literally, labour without rest; for when he desisted from his usual employments, it was always either under the pressure of illness, or from the necessity of some special task, and his normal habits were invariably resumed immediately on the cause of their interruption being removed. That ministry at large by which he made the whole kingdom his parish, lasted about fifty years, and all those years were similarly occupied by him. Not a day in them, which could be so used, was exempted from the common use, and not a part of any day in which his uniform purpose could be forwarded was otherwise spent. Every scrap of time was appropriated according to a pre-arranged plan, and the full amount of appropriation was secured by an attention to the most exact order of procedure. At four o'clock each morning the business of the day began, and it was ordinarily finished between nine and ten o'clock each night. As many sermons were daily preached as could be crowded into the time, all hours being made available for that kind of service. Reading was carried on along with travelling. Literary undertakings were pursued at all intervals which could be snatched from the more regular exercises. This preaching, travelling, reading and writing, was mixed with a constant visitation of societies and individuals in every place where Methodism had taken root. The concentration of power by which these connected and continued efforts were effected, is as remarkable as anything belonging to them. Mr. Wesley seemed for the most part to have all his energies at all times at his command. One aim, that of enforcing what he believed to be religious truth, he kept steadily before his eyes; and he was prepared to fulfil it at every step he took. He

never agitated himself, and never suffered himself to flag. He plunged into no action that he had not previously made up his mind about, and he conducted what he had thus decided upon with a quiet confidence peculiar to himself. Thus he said: "Though I am always in haste, I am never in a hurry; because I never undertake any more work than I can go through with perfect calmness of spirit."* His preaching was the plain, pointed utterance, without rant or affectation, of what he had to deliver. So it was with his writings. He composed slowly, forming every word with cautious accuracy, but never pausing and never looking back. Whatever he did was done with the deliberation arising from a knowledge beforehand of how it should be done, and was dismissed with the consciousness that it had been done according to the intention entertained.

Perhaps this is the proper place to say a word or two upon the manner of Mr. Wesley's preaching, an allusion to that topic having just been made. At this distance of time we are not likely to form a perfect idea of it. Matters that concern voice and action must be left very much to the imagination, though some little is known in this direction. His voice was a very flexible one, and his action was the opposite of violent. Any peculiarities attaching to him in these respects were overborne by the naturalness of his whole demeanour. His glance was singularly piercing. "As soon as he got upon the stand," says John Nelson, "he stroked back his hair, and turned his face toward where I stood, and I thought fixed his eyes upon me. His countenance struck such an awful dread upon me before I heard him speak, that it made my heart beat like the pendulum of a clock, and when he did speak I thought his whole discourse was aimed at me."† His appeals very frequently assumed a personal character, being addressed to his hearers not as an undistinguished mass, but as though he could single out the individuals to whom they applied; and what he said conveyed the impression that his own thought and feeling fully answered to the doctrine he proclaimed. It was a striking expression of Mr. Moore's—"At this moment I well remember my first thought after hearing him preach

---

* Wesley's Works, Vol. XII. p. 287.

† The Journal of Mr. John Nelson, p. 14.

nearly fifty years ago: '*Spiritual* things are *natural* things to this man.'"* I have understood that he seemed to be entirely freed from all fear of man and all desire of applause. He manifested no anxiety in the prospect of any service he undertook, nor did he appear to care about fulfilling expectations that might be entertained concerning him. What others thought of his ministrations was, as far as could be seen, excluded altogether from his consideration. Preparation for preaching did not mean with him what it commonly means. He did not previously make sermons, but put into his sermons the thoughts with which his heart was charged at the time of delivery. He adapted himself without hesitation and without violence to the exigencies of each occasion as it presented itself, and his profoundest expositions were those in which he most trusted to the fulness of the fountain of sentiment within his heart. All that I have said on the manner of Mr. Wesley's preaching falls under the head of that simplicity which is emphatically noticed in the quotation with which I commenced. We cannot be far wrong in attributing a great part of the power exerted by him to the impression produced by such simplicity. In all cases where earnestness of religious purpose exists on the part of the hearers, nothing is so attractive as the undoubted conviction that they are being dealt with by the preacher on principles of unaffected truth. His perfect sincerity enables him to communicate to them not only the full power of the doctrine he proclaims, but also the force of character belonging to himself. Such preaching as I have described may have been subject to variations, but the effect of it, when at its best, must have been very great indeed.

The collectedness with which, under difficult and exciting circumstances, Mr. Wesley pursued the even tenor of his way is sometimes very impressive. The scene at St. Mary's, Oxford, when he delivered what he was persuaded was the last sermon he would be permitted to preach before the University, is one of the deepest interest, and must, at the time, have filled the heart of every spectator with emotion; but the chief actor in it thus records his subsequent pro-

---

* Moore's Life of Wesley, Vol. II. p. 441.

ceedings on the same day, as though the usual current of his life had been uninterrupted. "I left Oxford about noon, preached at Wycombe in the evening."* He was engaged to preach at the Bedford assizes in March 1758; and this is his account of the fulfilment of his engagement:

"On Thursday 9, I rode to Bedford, and found the sermon was not to be preached till Friday. Had I known this in time, I should never have thought of preaching it; having engaged to be at Epworth on Saturday. . . . Fri. 10. The congregation at St. Paul's was very large and very attentive. The Judge, immediately after sermon, sent me an invitation to dine with him. But having no time, I was obliged to send my excuse, and set out between one and two. The north-east wind was piercing cold, and, blowing exactly in our face, soon brought an heavy shower of snow, then of sleet, and afterwards of hail. However, we reached Stilton at seven, about thirty miles from Bedford."†

If we only attended to the amount of Mr. Wesley's exertions, we might perhaps be inclined to compassionate him on account of the burden of toil which they would seem to have imposed: but all idea of compassion vanishes when we mark the cheerful temper he invariably preserved. A happier man never lived. His extraordinary healthiness and strength of constitution no doubt contributed greatly to his happiness, and he must have had a natural pleasure in travelling from place to place: but the chief element in his prevailing satisfaction was the serenity of his mind. No trials ruffled his feeling. In the midst of disappointment and opposition he was without care. He was not only assured of the purity of his intentions, but he was equally assured that each of his duties was faithfully discharged. He slept at night, conscious that all the calls of the day had been answered, and he rose in the morning with a day's work before him which he felt both able and willing to perform. He had no more sense of shortcoming than he had of positive sin, and his hope toward God was as bright as his love for man. Difficulties anticipated were the occasions of his faith, and difficulties overcome were the subjects of his praise. Nor did he strain himself unnecessarily in any efforts he made, but always had a reserve of power at command. As compared with Mr. Whitfield, or his brother Charles, his labours

---

* Wesley's Works, Vol. I. p. 470. † Ibid. Vol. II. p. 435.

lay lightly upon him; for he had no experience of the passionate excitements of the former, nor the melancholy forebodings of the latter. Sunshine characterized the atmosphere he habitually breathed.

As he grew older he was obliged somewhat to alter his methods of procedure. He travelled in a chaise instead of upon horseback, and he became dependent upon the assistance of a constant companion: he even took some relaxation in the form of visiting interesting spots for the pleasure which their sight afforded. But this pleasure was invariably connected with the performance of duty, more or less; and, to the very last, the same unwearied diligence distinguished him as he had shewn at the beginning. There is an apparent contradiction in the statements concerning him at the latest period of his life, which may deserve a moment's notice. He is represented sometimes as so feeble, as to have been incapable of going through the public services in which he engaged; and at other times, during the same journeys, he is represented as endowed with almost his pristine vigour. Both representations are correct. When a worn-out old man, he could rouse himself to unexpected manifestations of both bodily and mental power. What he was on one day, or on one part of the day, did not answer to what he was at another. The energy of his youth never entirely forsook him, and his determination remained unchanged in the midst of his weakest infirmities. The consequence was, that the dying flame occasionally burst forth, as if the taper had been lighted afresh, when it seemed to be only destined to expire. As I try thus to depict the course of unremitting exertion which was fulfilled by John Wesley, I feel ashamed of my own life; and it is only by the mention of this feeling of shame that I can adequately express my admiration of what I describe. I certainly have a little sympathy with what Dr. Johnson said of him: "John Wesley's conversation is good, but he is never at leisure. He is always obliged to go at a certain hour. This is very disagreeable to a man who loves to fold his legs and have out his talk as I do."* But the sympathy fades away in the presence of a higher emotion, when I recollect how great was the sacrifice which a man taught and bred and

---

* Boswell's Life of Johnson, under date of March 31, 1778.

qualified as he was, must have made in order to renounce altogether this folding of the legs. Amusement, in the ordinary acceptation of the word, he might have dismissed without much regret; but to reject all intellectual ease and gratification, was to offer on the altar of duty a priceless gift. He undoubtedly had a strong aptitude for literary culture. His tastes and tendencies were those of a scholar. Had he devoted himself to scholarly pursuits, he must have become famous in the world of thought, and he was eminently fitted to be the associate of clever and studious men.

Men in his own time were struck with his entire devotion to his ministerial occupation, and they generally accounted for it by assuming that a desire for worldly profit lay at the bottom of his conduct. "Dear madam," said a gentleman who had listened impatiently to a commendation of Mr. Wesley's disinterestedness,—

"Dear madam, you spoil all. You would make him out a fool. We all know Mr. Wesley is a great man—a gentleman, a scholar, a philanthropist—a very great man; but depend upon it he knows what he is about. Wait and see. *Disinterestedness*—No, madam; you may be certain he is no such fool."*

A canny Scotchman of the lower sort once put him to the question in true national form, having adopted, perhaps in compliment, a similar kind of judgment. In describing a journey in 1753 between Bowness and Dumfries, he says:

"Our landlord, as he was guiding us over the Frith, very innocently asked, how much a year we got by preaching thus. This gave me an opportunity of explaining to him that kind of gain which he seemed utterly a stranger to. He appeared to be quite amazed, and spake not one word, good or bad, till he took his leave."†

Sandy, in all probability, though extremely puzzled, did not know how far he was wrong. With what a refreshing breeze of indignation Mr. Wesley himself blew all such suspicions away!

"For what gain, setting conscience aside, will *you* be obliged to act thus? To live exactly as I do? For what price will you

---

* Moore's Life of Wesley, Vol. II. p. 457.

† Wesley's Works, Vol. II. p. 285.

preach, and that with all your might, and not in an easy, indolent, fashionable way, eighteen or nineteen times every week; and this throughout the year? What shall I give you to travel seven or eight hundred miles, in all weathers, every two or three months? For what salary will you abstain from other diversions than the doing good and the praising God? I am mistaken if you would not prefer strangling to such a life, even with thousands of gold and silver."*

This picture cannot be completed without reference to the fact that, in the early part of his public course at least, Mr. Wesley was actually poor. There are many indications of this, though he says little about it himself. He exposed himself to the severest personal privations, until circumstances, quite independent of any means of direct support, raised him above all fear of want. We learn, for example, from John Nelson's account, among other facts of a similar character, that when he travelled with him in Cornwall, they slept for weeks upon a floor, and John was obliged to work at his trade of a mason.†

I will now resume the thread of my account.

It was not long after Mr. Wesley had begun his career as the Director of the Methodist societies, that he lost his mother. She died in 1742. Her last request expressed her sense of the life of trouble through which she had passed. "Children, as soon as I am released, sing a psalm of praise to God." ‡ This loss was more important in its general results than may at first sight appear. Mr. Wesley was not only deeply attached to his mother, but very much influenced by her opinion. He took to himself credit for implicit obedience to her in everything lawful. "I told my own mother," he said, "pressing me to marry: I dare not allow you a positive voice herein. I dare not marry a person because you bid me. But I must allow you a negative voice. I will marry no person if you forbid. I know it would be a sin against God."§

When she was taken from him, all close family ties between him and others were broken. He was intimate with his brother Charles; but from social disagreements, as well

---

* Wesley's Works, Vol. VIII. p. 38.

† Nelson's Journal, pp. 89, 90. ‡ Wesley's Works, Vol. I. p. 384.

§ Tyerman's Life of John Wesley, Vol. III. p. 364.

as differences of opinion the intimacy lessened as they grew older. He acted kindly toward his sisters without manifesting any deep sympathy with them. His wife did not bear toward him the ordinary affection of a wife. He may almost be said to have stood alone, as far as the natural connections of life were concerned. His heart found other objects for the exercise of its trust and love; but it was outside of the circle of home that he was compelled to seek them. We should not have a true view of his case if we did not take such facts into our account.

We cannot justly abstain from connecting this accidental exclusion with that purposed exclusion from the sympathies of general society which he had during so many years to endure. He was treated as an outcast from the world. His efforts and those of his coadjutors were met by the most brutal opposition on the part of a large portion of the population. This opposition extended itself to the employment of physical force in its grossest forms. Nor were they only the rude and ignorant masses of men who engaged in this vulgar aggression. Gentlemen, by station and education, condescended to the lowest means of violence: publications issued against Methodism by men of some literary skill were obviously calculated to inflame the popular rage; magistrates did not hesitate to lend the sanction of their authority to criminal proceedings, which set all social order at defiance; and ministers of the Church of England were frequently as active in deeds of blackguardism and cruelty as the vilest refuse of their parishioners. His coadjutors more than shared with him in this persecution. Mud and sticks, rotten eggs and stones, were thrown at them. Their voices were drowned in shouting and drumming. They were dragged from the places where they stood. They were beaten and thrown into pools. They were pressed for soldiers, and confined in prisons. In more than one instance their lives were sacrificed to the malicious wrath of their enemies.

What was the cause of all this? I think too much has been said by way of attributing it to motives which have in them some element of justification or excuse. Fears of popery, political fears and other tolerable considerations, have been talked about. But the great reason lay else-

where. It was the hatred to religion itself which is felt by ungodly men. Such hatred may lie dormant till stung with sharp rebuke; but it exhibits itself in the kind of conduct answering to its nature when roused by painful contact with the object of its hostility. This contact could not be escaped where Methodism prevailed. The religious agency shewed itself in the open air, and confronted every one who walked the streets. It appeared in no negative form; but came boldly, reproving vice and calling for the fulfilment of responsibilities. Its call was loud, and its reproof unqualified. What was more than all, its reforming efforts were successful. When its voice was admitted, its appeal was found to be irresistible. How near it would come, no one could tell. It might affect men's dearest connections, if not themselves. How great the changes it would produce could not be calculated upon. It might revolutionize the whole condition of things amid which men were now content to live. Surely this was not to be endured. Therefore the influence must be put down in any manner and at every risk.

The holding of the first Conference proved an important event in Mr. Wesley's life. It took place in 1744. The object of the meeting was to consult upon the affairs relating to the work in which he was engaged, with those who assisted him in that work. It was originally composed of clergymen and lay-preachers, but some of its earlier sessions were attended by persons not belonging to the ministerial class. It became the organized means of action for the body of regular itinerants whom Methodism raised up. These itinerants, though wholly devoted to the office of the ministry, were not regarded as clergymen, but as helpers to Mr. Wesley in the discharge of his clerical duties. When the Conference was legally defined for the sake of preserving chapel property, its functions were not extended beyond the government of its own members. These facts make a wide difference between the earlier Conferences and those of the present day.

What kind of men were these lay-preachers in Mr. Wesley's time? They were mostly men of narrow education, though some of them were well cultivated. Thomas Walsh, Joseph Benson, Adam Clarke and Henry Moore, were distinguished by very considerable literary attainments. With

few exceptions, they possessed strong sense and great determination of character. Some of them were celebrated for the excellence of their pulpit talents. Samuel Bradburn was one of the finest orators of his age. In their labours and privations they trod in the steps of their master. Their sincerity in their work was especially tested by the very small remuneration they received. They lived at best upon scanty supplies of food and clothing, and it was not uncommon with them to enter upon their ministry with no prospect of support at all. Their sermons commonly consisted in the enforcement of a few points of essential Christian truth, as they understood it, which were rendered powerful by the experimental form in which they were almost invariably set. When we connect with this substance of their addresses, the necessity of extemporaneous speech to which they were subjected, and the frequent change of their audiences, we must see that the limitations attaching to them were more than balanced by the special advantages of their position. It is said of Dr. Priestley that, when at Leeds he had heard Thomas Mitchell, who was esteemed but a poor preacher, he replied to Dr. Hey, who was ashamed of the performance: "Other men *may* do good, Dr. Hey; but that man *must* do good, for he aims at nothing else."* The Lives of many of these preachers, chiefly written by themselves, have been collected and published under the editorship of the Rev. Thomas Jackson; and a part of Southey's Life of Wesley is devoted to an abridgment of some of the most striking of their autobiographies. To me, that portion of Southey's work is more interesting than any other. John Nelson's Journal, which I have quoted more than once, contains, I think, the finest representation of one of this class. A bold nature, subdued but not weakened by religious principle; a clear understanding, softened but not obscured by devotional fervour; an unwearied activity, elevated but not lessened by benevolent feeling,—make up altogether a type of the true Englishman when touched to the higher issues of life, which is worthy to be compared with that of John Bunyan himself. He could argue closely, though roughly, on questions that he understood—on the Calvinistic controversy and on Popish superstition, for in-

* Moore's Life of Wesley, Vol, II. p, 12.

stance—but his preaching was independent of all logical preparation, being the spontaneous utterance, whenever opportunity called, of the desire for the salvation of mankind with which his soul was filled.

These men Mr. Wesley did his best to improve. Besides other works of various kinds, the Christian Library,* in fifty volumes, which contains a most admirable selection of theological literature, was published by him for their use. In addition to such general means of instruction, he was in the habit of personally superintending their studies.† He often acted as a classical tutor to Mr. Moore when they travelled in the same carriage.‡ Between him and his assistants there were differences which sometimes brought them into collision with one another; but he was a true friend and unwearied benefactor to all who were worthy of his regard, and no affection could be stronger or more tender than that which he excited in the breasts of those to whom his favour was extended. His connection with his preachers cannot, however, be passed by without a particular reference to the power he exercised over them. He claimed the right of receiving them or not, and of appointing them when, where and how to help him, as he pleased.§ It would have been well if he had moderated this claim, and admitted his fellow-labourers to a larger share of authority than he was in the habit of conceding. Many of them were fitted to exercise such authority, and would have been better by virtue of its exercise. Independence would have contributed to their strength, and enlarged their sense of responsibility. It would have been better for himself, as well as for his preachers, that the united judgment of both should have been followed rather than his personal will. It was impossible for him to act without paying considerable deference to the opinion around him, and he was thus exposed to the influence of persons who had an aptitude for management. He has been accused of shewing favouritism to those who appeared to be subservient to his wishes; and,

---

* In my last paper, the names of the Young Students' Library and the Christian Library were, by an oversight, transposed. The former was the production of the father, and the latter that of the son.

† Tyerman's Life of John Wesley, Vol. III. p. 236.

‡ Henry Moore's Sermons and Life, p. 415.

§ Wesley's Works, Vol. VIII. p. 312.

though such accusations are to be received with the caution which the disappointed feeling that commonly prompted them should produce, there is truth in the charge. As he sunk under the infirmities of age, the evil naturally increased. He was led to do and sanction things which his more vigorous manhood would have resisted. Men who had their own ends to serve, found it most easy to serve them by encouraging his sense of authority. He came to consider himself as under the special protection and guidance of Providence ;* and, while more subject to the direction of others, he acted with a greater assumption of absoluteness. It would be right to cast a veil over these venial weaknesses of an old man, if it were not for the great lesson they teach, that anything short of the full justice appropriate to the social transactions in which we engage, will vindicate its real character in the injury which it occasions to ourselves. Mr. Wesley deceived himself when he said that his power was given to him, not taken by him. It was not taken in the sense of being demanded in opposition to the will of those who submitted to it, but it was not given in the sense of being voluntarily offered by them. It was simply assumed and granted. It has one advantage, indeed, in the eye of an observer. It obliges us to consider all the aid which he received, in the light of a mere extension of his own efforts They who helped him were his representatives in the full sense of the term.

The establishment of the Conference was followed by the formation of Circuits. They comprised separate districts of country to which the preachers were severally appointed during each year. The first list of circuits with which I am acquainted bears the date of 1746.† Thus the people whom Methodism gathered together were associated under distinct ministerial supervision.

The character of these people was sufficiently marked in its general features to admit of specific description. Methodism succeeded in producing a common type of Christian manhood. There can be no doubt that the Methodists, as a whole, cultivated a pure and high morality. Their faith and discipline were strongly directed to this end. It is equally clear that asceticism entered largely into their

* Tyerman's Life of John Wesley, Vol. III. p. 619.

† Watson's Life of Wesley, p. 270.

practice. Amusement in most of its forms was carefully shunned by them. Nor should it be denied that they were a superstitious people. Dreams, and visions, and intercourse with a spiritual world, occupied a considerable part of their thought. They were not well-informed; but, considering their station, the charge of ignorance cannot be established against them. Mr. Wesley did whatever lay in his power to bring general knowledge within their reach. History, biography, poetry, philosophy, science, fiction, languages, as well as theology, were comprised in the subjects of his very numerous publications. The Arminian Magazine, which he issued during the latter years of his life, is wonderful for the variety and interest of its contents. When I was a boy, its volumes were as attractive to me as any books on which I could lay my hand; and I was scarcely more absorbed in its tales than in its metaphysical disquisitions. The Calvinistic controversy afforded to all classes of Methodists an occasion of mental training. The poorest members were more or less acquainted with it; and they had in Mr. Fletcher's Checks to Antinomianism the means of directing their acquaintance to the most profitable results. The mixture in those Checks of acute argumentation with elevated sentiment is still delightful to the reader, and must have come home with a strong force of mental nurture to persons who were religiously prepared for this intellectual food. The manner in which light and fire were struck out of natures apparently insensible to all good, is among the most marvellous successes of Methodism. But the great peculiarity of Methodist character consisted in the absorption of other human interests in the one interest supplied by the religious fellowship that was formed. To a Methodist, Methodism was everything. It coloured the whole of life, and supplied the great purpose of action. Its outward services were multitudinous; its inward occupation was unceasing. Its method of administration involved a continued call upon the attention. Its preachings, and prayer-meetings, and class-meetings, and visitings, not only supplied means of constant engagement, but warmly fostered the spirit of mutual sympathy and dependence. The Methodist church had all the consolidation of a religious order.*

---

* John Wesley, by Julia Wedgwood, p. 247.

I have, elsewhere, remarked upon the powerful influence which the Methodist hymn-book had in the formation and expression of religious feeling; but, in addition to the contents of that book, there were a vast number of hymns supplied by Charles Wesley from time to time. These separate collections of sacred poetry preceded the use of the common hymn-book; and there was nothing either relating to the ordinary circumstances of humanity, or to the occurrence of particular events, which was not thus consecrated. Birth, marriage and death; prosperity and adversity; youth, manhood and age: public transactions, the characters of individuals, and national hopes—these, and all other things that could by possibility be so improved, were made matters of poetic treatment. There was scarcely a person known and esteemed by the Methodists whose death was not celebrated in this way. It is impossible to imagine how great was the effect of this instrumentality in the creation of one interest throughout the societies, which were thus furnished with methods of prayer and praise of universal application. The opportunities of religious exercise could always be profitably seized, because the fitting appliances for such exercise were always at hand. When poor Thomas Beard, who on account of his preaching had been impressed for a soldier, died in the Newcastle Hospital, Charles Wesley celebrated his martyrdom in strains which thus began:

> "Soldier of Christ, adieu!
> Thy conflicts here are past;
> The Lord hath brought thee through,
> And given the crown at last:
> Rejoice to wear the glorious prize,
> Rejoice with God in Paradise."*

What Methodist heart would not yield to the full force of that song of triumph; grief and indignation contributing to swell the joy that was felt? Who among the persecuted community would not respond to this succeeding verse, in a spirit of undying attachment to the cause whose misfortunes were its noblest glories?

> "Thy victory we share,
> Thy glorious joy we feel;

---

* Jackson's Centenary of Wesleyan Methodism, p. 362.

Parted in flesh we are,
But joined in spirit still;
And still we on our brethren call,
And praise the common Lord of all."*

It should be remembered that these poems were not only read by those for whose benefit they were composed, but were actually sung by them under the circumstances to which they referred; singing being as common an exercise, among this generation of Methodists, as was the religious conversation in which they engaged.

In 1751, John Wesley was married. His relations to his wife were very unhappy; but the fault seems to have been invariably on her side. He had stipulated with her that his marriage should not make any change in the manner of his public life; and his adherence to this stipulation was the source of his offence. It was perhaps best that she took the offence she did. He said to Mr. Moore, "that if Mrs. Wesley had been a better wife, and had continued to act in that way in which she knew well how to act, he might have been unfaithful in the great work to which the Lord had called him, and might have too much sought to please her according to her own views."†

He has been sometimes represented as a man of a hard nature, and the affection which exhibits itself in close friendship has been especially denied to him. I not only think that this representation does not answer to fact, but I am persuaded that the facts concerning him reveal a nature distinguished for its tenderness and warmth. He was very susceptible of fond impressions. Three of his love stories are recorded with considerable fulness, and each of them indicates strongly passionate feeling. The one relating to Grace Murray, which he has himself expanded in all its details, is remarkable, among similar accounts, for the fervour of attachment it displays. In the case of Miss Sophy we see him manifesting, as few others would have done, the irritation of disappointed love; and he certainly engaged himself to Mrs. Vizelle under the impulse of a sudden infatuation. A certain kind of woman always exerted a great power over him; and no employment seemed

---

* Jackson's Centenary of Wesleyan Methodism, p. 363.

† Moore's Life of Wesley, Vol. II. p. 175.

more congenial to his taste than converse with his female disciples. He was undoubtedly capable of ardent friendship. Such friendship existed between Mr. Fletcher and him. Mr. Moore was admitted to his friendship on the terms which prevail between a father and a son. "No man in England," he said, "has contradicted me so much as you have done, Henry, and yet I love you still."* Mr. Moore's first wife was a sweet and high-souled woman; and it could not but be a deep regard which thus expressed itself toward her: "I shall be glad, if I can, to have Nancy and you at Bristol next year. It is not unlikely I may finish my course there; and if so, I should love to have her to close my eyes."†

Perhaps there is no form of sympathy which could not be illustrated by some striking incident taken from Mr. Wesley's life. In running my thoughts over such incidents, I feel regret at the very scanty selection I am obliged to make.

He was trustful of others to an almost foolish degree. His credulity arose in a great measure from this trustfulness. There is a marked difference between the carefulness with which he examined what came under his own observation, and the implicit faith with which he received the testimony of others. On an occasion when he thought his confidence had been abused, he amusingly revealed his consciousness of this kind of infirmity by saying, with some warmth, "I have been too tender of these men. *You* should have opposed my receiving them again. You know I halt on that foot."‡

To trustfulness must be added forbearance. His conduct toward his wife was patient in the extreme. He was a hot-tempered and hasty man; but he bore without public complaint the most shameful wrongs from one who was bound to love and honour him implicitly. She was possessed by the demon of jealousy. Under this inspiration, she resorted to the most vulgar means of annoyance and injury. She stole his papers, haunted his movements, slandered his character, conspired with his enemies, renounced his society, tormented him with her tongue, beat him with her

---

* Tyerman's Life of John Wesley, Vol. III. p. 567. † Ibid. p. 543.

‡ Moore's Life of Wesley, Preface, Vol. I. p. iv.

hands. But he neither resented her treatment, nor replied to her accusations. His confidence in his own innocence was perhaps, with her, his greatest crime. He was, to the very last, courteous in his behaviour to her, and willing to receive her whenever she sought his care. Charles Wesley gives this account of his refusal to expose some of the basest attempts she had made against his honour.

"My brother is indeed an extraordinary man. I placed before him the importance of the character of a minister; the evil consequences that might result from his indifference to the cause of religion; stumbling-blocks cast in the way of the weak; and urged him by every relative and public motive to answer for himself and stop the publication. His reply was, Brother, when I devoted to God my ease, my time, my life, did I except my reputation? No." *

His placability was so conspicuous, that Mr. Hampson, who wrote his life under a sense of supposed injustice committed toward himself and his father, chooses this quality for special commendation. Perhaps no man was under greater obligations to him than Thomas Maxfield, notable as his first regularly appointed lay-preacher. Maxfield forsook him, and, under very vexatious circumstances, set up in London a rival preaching-house. Years of alienation passed, when we meet with these entries in his Journal:

"1782, Dec., Sat. 21. I visited Mr. Maxfield, struck with a violent stroke of palsy. He was senseless, and near death; but we besought God for him, and his spirit revived....1783, Feb., Sun. 2. Mr. Maxfield continuing ill, I preached this afternoon at his chapel. Prejudice seems now dying away. God grant it may never revive." †

His forgiveness of injuries did not exceed his acknowledgment of faults. A preacher had thrown up his ministerial calling on account of some personal offence, and was settled in one of the large towns of the kingdom. Years after, Mr. Wesley, on visiting the town, heard of his residing there, and also of his religious declension. He called upon him and offered to restore him to the ministry, saying that

---

* Jackson's Abridged Memoir of Charles Wesley, p. 358.

† Wesley's Works, Vol. IV. p. 242.

he did so because he thought he himself was guilty of some injustice toward him. It came out in the course of conversation that he was in debt. Mr. Wesley persuaded him to prepare an account of his pecuniary obligations by the next day, and repeated his visit then. A large sum was mentioned as the ascertained liability, but the kind-hearted old man offered immediately to pay the whole sum, if the aggrieved brother would resume the service he had forsaken.

His charity was a literal fulfilment of his own precept, "Give all you can." He was, during a considerable number of years, in the receipt of a large income from the sale of his books; but he gave it away as soon as it came into his hands. He did not wait for opportunities of good, but paid off whatever he possessed at the present time, as if he owed a standing debt. Thirty pounds a year was the extent of his ministerial stipend, but a thousand pounds a year did not exhaust his pecuniary gifts.* A great part of his benevolence was concealed, and he gave as if he were conferring a favour. "He never relieved poor people in the street but he took off or removed his hat to them when they thanked him."† An artist gave him ten guineas for sitting to have his bust taken, and he distributed it in charity before he returned home.‡ When he came into possession of a legacy of a thousand pounds, he disposed of it so quickly, that within a year afterwards he thus answered the application of his sister, Mrs. Hall:

"You do not consider that money never stays with me; it would burn me if it did. I throw it out of my hands as soon as possible, lest it should find a way into my heart. Therefore you should have spoken to me while in London, and before Miss Lewin's money flew away. However, I know not but I may still spare you £5, provided you will not say, 'I will never ask you again.'"§

His mercifulness should also be mentioned. He had that compassion for the faults of others which "hopeth all things, endureth all things." A barber in Leeds, named William Shent, was in the earliest days of Methodism one of the

---

* Tyerman's Life of John Wesley, Vol. III. pp. 615, 616.

† Ibid. p. 616.

‡ Wakeley's Anecdotes of the Wesleys, pp. 151—157.

§ Tyerman's Life of John Wesley, Vol. II. p. 590.

most active friends of the cause. He was afterwards convicted of some wrong, and had fallen into great distress. In 1779, Mr. Wesley thus addressed the Methodists of Keighley, where, I suppose, poor William then resided.

"I have a few questions which I desire may be proposed to the society at Keighley. Who was the occasion of the Methodist preachers first setting foot in Leeds? William Shent. Who received John Nelson into his house at his first coming thither? William Shent. Who was it that invited me and received me when I came? William Shent. Who was it that stood by me while I preached in the street with stones flying on every side? William Shent. Who was it that bore the storm of persecution for the whole town, and stemmed it at the peril of his life? William Shent. Whose word did God bless for many years in an eminent manner? William Shent's. By whom were many children now in paradise begotten in the Lord—and many now alive? William Shent. Who is he that is ready now to be broken up and turned into the street? William Shent. And does nobody care for this? William Shent fell into sin, and was publicly expelled the society: but must he be also starved? Must he, with his grey hairs and all his children, be without a place to lay his head? Can you suffer this? Oh, tell it not in Gath! Where is gratitude? Where is compassion? Where is Christianity? Where is humanity? Where is concern for the cause of God? Who is a wise man among you? Who is concerned for the gospel? Who has put on bowels of mercy? Let him arise and exert himself in this matter. You, here, all arise as one man, and roll away the reproach. Let us set him on his feet once more. It may save both him and his family. But what we do, let it be done quickly."*

I am inclined to class Mr. Wesley's sprightliness in conversation with the sympathy of which I have been speaking. He was noted for his sharp, pithy replies. Beau Nash suffered grievously in an encounter with him at this kind of practice. But what I chiefly mark in the specimens of his quickness which are recorded, is their humorous appreciation of character. His rebukes commonly owe their point to this humour. Nothing can be richer than his privately asking a young officer, who was his fellow-passenger in a coach, and who had indulged in profane language, to grant

---

* Tyerman's Life of John Wesley, Vol. III. p. 289.

him a great favour, and then saying: "As we have to travel together some distance, I beg, if I should so far forget myself as to swear, that you will kindly reprove me;"* but it is the truth of feeling with which he entered into the case of his companion that renders the incident so comical as it is.

Nearly allied to the geniality of disposition which the circumstance of his marriage has led me to dwell upon, is the openness of character which belonged to Mr. Wesley. His brother Charles said of him, that he was "born for the benefit of knaves;"† and he is thus described in one of Charles's letters: "You expect he will keep his own secrets. Let me whisper it into your ear: He never could do it since he was born. It is a gift which God has not given him."‡ He left his most private affairs free to the inspection of those who were on terms of intimacy with him; and he took a kind of satisfaction in fully explaining all matters concerning himself which came under the observation of others. Some of his severest trials arose from this simplicity of behaviour. Few men would have put upon paper the minute account of his connection with Grace Murray, which he caused to be written out for special preservation. It fell into the hands of his wife, and was doubtless used by her during his lifetime, as it has been used against him since his death. But the chief inference to be drawn from it, is in favour of that transparency of action which is only reconcilable with the most perfect innocency of intention. There can be nothing more directly opposed to the politic character frequently attributed to him than this openness is. Darkness of design belongs essentially to such a character, whereas his motives, as well as his deeds, were always exposed to light; and he is to be judged, in cases of doubt, as though nothing had been, on his part, kept back from the means of forming a correct decision.

The next event I shall notice, as marking one of the stages of Mr. Wesley's life, was the publication in 1770 of

---

* Wakeley's Anecdotes of the Wesleys, p. 126.

† Jackson's Abridged Memoirs of Charles Wesley, p. 43.

‡ Moore's Life of Wesley, Vol. II. p. 273.

the Minutes of Conference, that originated the great controversy which separated him and his people from the Calvinistic associations they had, up to that time, been permitted in some measure to cultivate. This controversy will afford occasion for a word or two on the subject of the doctrinal teaching by which he produced the religious effects that followed his ministry.

From what has already been said, we may gather that the two distinctive principles of Methodist doctrine, were the direct influence of God's spirit in the formation of the Christian life, and the universal application to mankind of the redemption that is in Jesus. The second of these principles is subordinate to the first as to the power exerted by it upon character. We put aside for the present, then, the manner in which Arminianism modified the distinctive religion of Mr. Wesley's people, and concern ourselves with such manifestations as were common to both the Calvinistic and Arminian faith. Under the persuasion that it is seed which grows, I attend only to that which remained unchanged in its operation throughout the process under notice.

The most instructive representation of Mr. Wesley's belief, that a perceptible inspiration constitutes the specific form of Christian experience, is to be found in a correspondence between him and a person calling himself John Smith, which was first published by Mr. Moore.* It would fill a considerable volume, if printed by itself. John Smith is supposed, with reason, to have been Archbishop Secker; and the display both of talent and temper which he makes, is quite worthy of one occupying the highest position in the Church. Mr. Wesley's friends have said that in his part of the correspondence he does not rise to his natural level.† I think differently. He seems to me to have, purposely, done his very best for his cause. But the victory did not rest on his side. When matched with an opponent well armed and competently skilful, he was obliged to make damaging admissions, and was unable to put his case with

---

* Moore's Life of Wesley, Vol. II. p. 475, &c.

† Adam Clarke, as quoted in Southey's Common-place Book, Vol. I. p. 244; and Whitehead's Life of Wesley, Vol. II. p. 203.

the strength necessary to its establishment. I say this with some reluctance; for I know no production of his from which I rise with a higher estimate of his character than I do from this. But the statement I make is of importance, as it warrants the inference that what Mr. Wesley was disposed to rely upon as the kernel of his usefulness, was no more than the outward covering of the vital germ on which that usefulness depended. The matter of difference was thus well stated by John Smith:

"That there is inspiration, or the influence of the divine spirit, on the human spirit, is agreed by both parties; the whole of the question therefore turns upon the perceptibility of this inspiration. The question then is, does God's spirit work perceptibly on our spirit by *direct testimony* (as you elsewhere call it), by such *perceivable impulses* and *dictates* as are as distinguishable from the suggestions of our own faculties, as light is distinguishable from darkness (as the Quakers maintain); or does He *imperceptibly* influence our minds to goodness by gently and insensibly assisting our faculties, and biassing them aright? Here is the whole of the question."*

It is John Smith's view of this question that I myself adopt. But I do so with a profound conviction that the necessity of divine inspiration should be upheld against any mere reliance upon the natural exercise of our faculties. The former can be accepted and followed as an object of faith, though it be withdrawn from the realm of both bodily and mental sight. There is danger of this inspiration being forgotten or denied, and mere ethical considerations substituted for it. This danger Mr. Wesley's theology avoided and resisted; and it is but fair to acknowledge that, with the class of persons on whom he acted, the very error of perceptible inspiration into which he fell, assisted him in his efforts against that danger. How were the uncultivated and irreligious multitudes whom he addressed to be brought to a sense of God's presence and operation, but by being taught to identify them directly with the strong feelings with which their conversion was accompanied? How could those extremely sensitive individuals who were attracted by his appeals to their spiritual nature, be satisfied with their

* Moore's Life of Wesley, Vol. II. p. 518.

religious condition, but by such an interpretation of their inward impressions as caused them to trace in them, palpably, the finger of the Most High? Such exaggerated conceptions have always accompanied the enforcement of this point of Christian truth; and it behoves us, in these and similar instances, instead of rejecting or weakening the truth on account of the exaggerations, to welcome it the more ardently, as thus brought home to those whom it concerns, with greater clearness and force. There is a wide difference in the effect produced by the same doctrines as they may be differently delivered. Watson's Life of Wesley seems to have been written mainly for theological purposes; and in it the various points of Methodist doctrine are stated with a controversial distinctness which excites wonder as to how such merely intellectual conclusions could have been fruitful in the moral changes which Methodism exhibited. The very elaborateness of the development proves that the real source of power is not hit upon. In Moore's Life of Wesley the matter is very differently stated. Mr. Moore had a strong mystical tendency; and though the very same beliefs were held by him as those which Mr. Watson advocates, the result produced is not the same. It is the influence of the belief upon the soul, not its consistency as judged by the understanding, which Mr. Moore brings into prominence; and it was the former, not the latter, to which the spiritual influence of Mr. Wesley's own teaching is to be attributed. However imperfect the form of that teaching might be, it succeeded in bringing the inward life of those who accepted it under an apprehension of the constant supervision and action of God.

There was one characteristic of his administration which contributed greatly to the proper experimental recognition by his followers of the truth he proclaimed. I have alluded to it already, but it requires special mention here. I refer to the practical use he made of whatever doctrine he insisted upon. This was a very marked feature of his religious system; and it naturally led those who accepted that system from him, to correct the injurious results likely to arise from identifying moral feelings with dogmatic convictions. No such identification could, under the circumstances, be considered valid, which was not connected with that cultivation of holiness which brought the

heart into immediate contact with the divine realities contemplated. The estimate of Mr. Wesley's character given by Alexander Knox, in a paper inserted in the later editions of Southey's Life of Wesley, is remarkable for its mingled acuteness and sympathy, and this practical bearing of Mr. Wesley's preaching and writing is especially insisted upon by him. I quote a passage from it in confirmation of what I have advanced under this head:

"In the very moment of his highest excitation, Mr. Wesley estimates evangelical blessings on moral grounds, and tries himself exclusively by a moral standard. I confidently add, that in all the peculiarities of his subsequent course he never swerved from this principle; but, on the contrary, became more and more jealous of every opinion which could be thought to favour religious confidence, without the constant testimony of a good conscience. The doctrinal theories which he had embraced, and which he at length began to suspect of an 'Antinomian leaning,' were either renounced or corrected; and purity of heart and life, through the grace of Christ and the influence of the Holy Spirit, as it had been ever his ruling object, became at length the single matter to which he attached vital importance."*

There is the clearest evidence that, as here intimated, the practical element in Mr. Wesley's teaching became stronger as his life advanced. The declaration, that "in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with Him,"† rose to an axiom in his creed. In 1767, he thus concluded a remarkable entry in his journal:

"A mystic who denies justification by faith, Mr. Law for instance, may be saved. But if so, what becomes of *articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ?* If so, is it not high time for us, *Projicere ampullas, et sesquipedalia verba*, and return to the plain word, He that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with Him?"‡

In the celebrated Arminian Minutes, the passing of which has introduced these remarks upon doctrine, he said:

"Who of us is now accepted of God? He that now believes in Christ with a loving, obedient heart. But who among those that never heard of Christ? He that, according to the light he has, feareth God and worketh righteousness. Is this the same

---

* Southey's Life of Wesley, Vol. II. p. 301.

† Acts x. 35.

‡ Wesley's Works, Vol. III. p. 308.

with him that is sincere? Nearly, if not quite. Is not this salvation by works? Not by the merit of works, but by works as a condition. What have we then been disputing about for these thirty years? I am afraid about words."*

In a sermon on Faith, published in 1788, we read:

"What is the faith which is properly saving; which brings eternal salvation to all those that keep it to the end? It is such a divine conviction of God, and the things of God, as, even in its infant state, enables every one that possesses it to 'fear God and work righteousness.' And whosoever in every nation believes thus far, the apostle declares is 'accepted with Him.' He actually is at that very moment in a state of acceptance."†

I have much lessened the force of these passages by taking them from their connections; but as they here stand they will establish the conclusion for which I bring them forward, that the theology of Mr. Wesley was decidedly modified by the practical views of religion which he entertained. I do not mean to say that he gave up the theory of salvation which he originally adopted: what I say is, that he held it with more enlarged sympathies in relation to the differences existing in the Christian world. He was in the habit of claiming for himself in theory a charitableness of judgment which he did not always carry out in fact. He insisted upon the necessity of his own belief beyond what he professed to do, because he considered as essential to Christianity that which he himself felt compelled to enforce. But he ought, nevertheless, to have the benefit of the theory he laid down, as far as the sincerity of his profession in its favour is concerned. If he erred, it was not wilfully, but from the force of prejudice, which he identified with principle. Who can doubt the earnestness of the appeal which he made at the conclusion of his "Short History of the People called Methodists"? "We leave every man to enjoy his own opinion, and to use his own mode of worship, desiring only that the love of God and his neighbour be the ruling principle in his heart, and shew itself in his life by an uniform practice of justice, mercy and truth. And accordingly we give the right hand of fellowship to every lover of God

---

* Moore's Life of Wesley, Vol. II. p. 232.

† Wesley's Works, Vol. VII. p. 198.

and man, whatever his opinion or mode of worship may be, of which he is to give an account to God only."*

The practical and liberal character of Mr. Wesley's teachings was intimately connected with the position he took in the Calvinistic controversy. He was determinately opposed to the exclusiveness of Calvinism. He contended manfully for the universal application of the benefits of the work of Christ. It is hardly possible for us, in these days, to imagine the hostility of the Evangelical world to mere Arminianism, in Mr. Wesley's time. The doctrine of general redemption was denounced and treated as heresy of the most undoubted kind. No one could attach himself to it without incurring the suspicion of having departed from the essential truth of the gospel, on the part of those who deemed themselves the legitimate expouents of the doctrines of grace. It required great independence of mind to become the champion of this unauthorized faith; and those who followed the guidance of such an one, must have participated in his love of independence. We trace much of the beneficial influence of the Arminian theology of Methodism in this direction. It was connected with a large amount of freedom of thought. Though still remaining within the lines of orthodoxy, according to the ordinary application of that term, the Methodist community was distinguished from the Calvinistic associations with which it might be compared, by its sympathy with those who departed from fixed forms of dogmatism. Indeed, there were scattered throughout it, individuals whose orthodoxy was of a loose or partial character. Some of Mr. Wesley's statements can only be explained by this fact being more or less known to him.

All this tendency to enlargement of judgment and feeling I would bring to bear upon the point, that the spiritual effect of Mr. Wesley's teaching, as distinguished from its mere doctrinal expression, was the real secret of his power. Men opened their hearts the more completely to that divine working, the necessity of which was involved in every article of the Methodist faith, as those articles were subordinated to the liberty for practical purposes which they were especially taught to cultivate. This working needed, on account of their imperfect mental training, to be brought

---

* Wesley's Works, Vol. XIII. p. 344.

home to them by an almost material representation; but, when so brought home, there was little of prejudice, and less of moral indifference, to restrain them from yielding to it with that simple abandonment which the nature of the case demanded.

When we learn that Mr. Wesley selected as the standard of the doctrines to be taught to his societies, four volumes of his own Sermons, and his Notes on the New Testament, our first reflection most likely is, that this was a palpable instance of his enormous self-confidence; and certainly such an act cannot be freed from objection on that ground. But there is a very different view of the matter to be taken, which is at least as true as the disparaging one. It was, I firmly believe, not for the end of strict supervision, but for the almost contrary end of reasonable allowance, that this selection was made. It was, indeed, only as an interpretation of the Articles of the Church of England that these extensive writings were intended to be used. The case is very different now. No more dangerous instrument could be put into the hands of such a body as the Wesleyan Conference than this wide statement of doctrine. It can be readily used for any purpose to which the Conference for the time being may think proper to apply it. It has been used over and over again to accomplish objects which Mr. Wesley could not contemplate, and to enforce judgments which he would undoubtedly have reprobated. There is this hopeful consideration in the case: that the unlimited licence, which has been taken so often for the enforcement of tyrannous proceedings, may, in better days to come, be demanded in the interest of measures for beneficial change. That is about the only comfort which remains. Now that comfort existed, not in expectation, but in actual experience, under Mr. Wesley's administration. Applied by a conscientious man, according to his own sense of right, instead of by a corporation notoriously without conscience, and ruled by interest not by right, this standard of doctrine, because it was so wide, was the means of bringing out those wise and charitable adaptations which each instance of examination admitted of; and a higher justice was thus done than any narrower regulations could have compassed. It would be easy to illustrate this by reference to Mr. Wesley's dealing with individuals; but a better illustration is contained

in the well-known facts; that matters of doctrine were, from time to time, freely debated in the Conferences over which he presided with autocratic sway; and that in this most carefully guarded department, errors were confessed and changes agreed upon in a manner quite distinctive of those ecclesiastical associations. Surely the man is to be highly honoured, who, in so many instances, turned the authority which he claimed and exercised over others, to a more certain means of concession and a greater flexibility of good.

It has already been intimated that Mr. Wesley was powerfully assisted by Mr. Fletcher, the vicar of Madeley, in the controversy with his Calvinistic antagonists. He wished Mr. Fletcher to succeed him in the government of the Methodist societies; and, after the death of this coadjutor in 1785, a considerable change occurred in the relation of those societies to the Church of England. Measures for their establishment under a ministry to be supplied by the Conference were adopted, and a separate class of ministers was provided for, to whom special, though not at all well-defined powers were intended to be entrusted. A large portion of Mr. Wesley's subsequent life was occupied with the differences of opinion to which this line of procedure gave rise; and it is in the light cast upon it by the conduct which that procedure involved, that we have to contemplate the nature of his connection with the Church in which he was educated. With the Dissenting churches in the kingdom he had but little connection. He was always affected by some prejudice against Dissent as such; and this prejudice was increased by the fact that the then existing Dissent was distinguished either for its strict Calvinism or its doctrinal laxity. Many members of his societies were professed Dissenters, and a considerable number of his preachers became Dissenting ministers; but it was with the Church of England that he himself had chiefly to do. There is no doubt that he desired to remain in as close a union with it as possible, provided the objects of his own religious work were fulfilled. Whatever his conduct was, his feeling of attachment to the Church never seems to have wavered. He was in the habit, to the last, of strongly expressing that attachment, and earnestly exhorting his followers to avoid formal separation from the Establishment as it stood. But his practice widely departed from his theory. Act after act was com-

mitted or sanctioned by him, which could not be reconciled with the ecclesiastical order of the institution of which he professed to continue a member ; and the Methodists gradually became as well-defined a community within their own lines, as the Church of England itself was. Attempts have been made to reason away the facts of this case, under the idea that no departure from Churchism was intended ; but the failure of such attempts is owing to the essential character of these facts having been missed. The Church interest was never with Mr. Wesley of paramount consideration. It was held subordinate to another and higher interest, and was unflinchingly sacrificed whenever that higher interest demanded the sacrifice. No greater sacrifice was made than the religious necessity for the time being seemed to require ; but, if that necessity had so determined, acts of wider separation than those which were committed, would have been as willingly performed as those were. Can any blame be justly attached to Mr. Wesley for the violations of Church order into which he was thus led? We may think some of his measures, such as the ordination, or consecration of certain preachers, to have been deficient in wisdom ; but we ought not, even in these instances, to consider him as acting beyond the right he possessed. If ever any one could justly occupy a position of authority in matters of ecclesiastical arrangement, he was entitled to it. Think of the provocations to which he was exposed on the part of the Church. His people said to him : How can we attend the ministrations of men, immoral in their lives, who are continually preaching against us, and whose persecutions we have to encounter day by day? That seems to have been the objection to conformity which was chiefly urged. Almost everything of a negative character would have been borne. Sermons with no savour of the gospel in them, Parsons living without the exercise of pastoral care, were submitted to. But injury, insult, wickedness ; how were these to be borne? Mr. Wesley was by these means driven into inconsistencies. Might he not have gloried in such inconsistencies? Was he to cast out of his heart that deep regard for the Church in which he had been bred, that caused it to stand before his imagination in an ideal beauty, which, though never realized, was always hoped for? Was he to refrain from discharging the duty to mankind which God had given him

the means and opportunity of performing, by obedience to any outward rules of man's appointment? He neither did the one nor the other; and he thus brought himself into circumstances under which his conduct did not always answer to his language. It is better that this charge against him should remain. It is a badge, and not a blot.

A few clergymen co-operated with him from the commencement to the close of his labours. Some of them entered wholly into his plans. In reading his Journals we seldom, during a great number of years, meet with a record of his preaching in churches; but as we approach toward the end, such records very frequently occur. In London, as elsewhere, he was sought for, as a popular preacher whose services were very valuable on charitable occasions. If it had been his ambition to do so, he might have connected himself, at this time, more closely with the Church, and obtained a share of its honours and emoluments. But he chose to remain among his own people. The path he had trod amid neglect and obloquy, he still trod amid smiles and commendations. There were those at the head of Church affairs who appreciated his labours at their due value in spite of their irregularity; for there was a silent conviction generally entertained, that the Church had gained more by this irregularity than by its own normal methods of action. The indirect benefits were greater than the direct ones. Charles Wesley the younger was, on account of his musical talents, a great favourite with George III. After the King had lost his sight, he "was one day with his Majesty alone, when the venerable monarch said, 'Mr. Wesley, is there anybody in the room but you and me?' 'No, your Majesty,' was the reply. The King then said, 'It is my judgment, Mr. Wesley, that your uncle, and your father, and George Whitfield, and Lady Huntingdon, have done more to promote true religion in the country than all the dignified clergy put together.'" *

The foregoing anecdote naturally brings us to the conclusion of our survey. Nothing is more characteristic of the last days of Mr. Wesley's life than the honour in which he was held. He was acknowledged to be the apostle of his age. The whole national scene was changed for him.

---

* Jackson, Abridged Life of Charles Wesley, p. 397.

Some perceptible inroad into the territory of sin and error was seen by all to have been effected. Religion assumed a position in the land, which none could refuse to treat with respect. I can conceive no satisfaction deeper and nobler, than that which this despised and ill-treated man must have felt, in the closing years of his life, as he looked back upon what he had passed through, and around upon what he had effected. He lived to gather, in a great measure, the harvest he had sown; and the prophecy had been fulfilled to him: "The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad, and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose."

"I was now considering," he said in 1785, "how strangely the grain of mustard-seed, planted about fifty years ago, has grown up. It has spread through all Great Britain and Ireland, the Isle of Wight and the Isle of Man; then to America, from the Leeward Islands, through the whole continent, into Canada and Newfoundland. And the societies in all these parts walk by one rule, knowing religion is holy tempers, and striving to worship God, not in form only, but likewise in spirit and in truth."*

In his case, "the evil bowed before the good, and the wicked at the gates of the righteous." Where he had been maltreated by furious mobs, the people, as at Hull, conveyed him to the town in a long procession;† or, as at Falmouth, crowded the streets to witness his entry.‡ When he preached, as in the market-place at Redruth, the congregation "not only filled all the windows, but sat on the tops of the houses."§ These scenes happened at the very end of his course.

As he approached that end, he suffered some little deterioration in other than physical respects. He became more enthusiastic in his notions. There are instances of his encouraging a belief in separate communion with the Persons of the Trinity.‖ But, on the other hand, he became more liberal in his practice. One of the latest entries in his Journal relates to his granting the use of one of his chapels in Bristol to the Lewin's-Mead congregation, and going himself to hear the minister preach.¶

* Wesley's Works, Vol. IV. p. 298.
† Tyerman's Life of John Wesley, Vol. III. p. 611.
‡ Wesley's Works, Vol. IV. p. 468. § Ibid. p. 398.
‖ Tyerman's Life of John Wesley, Vol. III. pp. 600, 606.
¶ Wesley's Works, Vol. IV. p. 494.

"Mr. Wesley was once asked by a lady, 'Suppose you knew you were to die at twelve o'clock to-morrow night, how would you spend the intervening time?' 'How, madam?' he replied; 'why just as I intend to spend it now. I should preach this night at Gloucester, and again at five to-morrow morning. After that I should ride to Tewkesbury, preach in the afternoon, and meet the societies in the evening. I should then repair to friend Martin's house, who expects to entertain me, converse and pray with the family as usual, retire to my room at ten o'clock, commend myself to my Heavenly Father, lie down to rest and wake up in glory."*

It was in this spirit and after this manner that he actually did die. The prayer of a hymn which he was constantly in the habit of using was fulfilled in him:

"O, that without a lingering groan,
I may the welcome word receive;
My body with my charge lay down,
And cease at once to work and live."

He died in 1791, being nearly eighty-eight years of age. He was appropriately buried at the back of the City-Road chapel—the Methodist Temple, that succeeded the Tabernacle of the Foundry. At the first Conference after his death the following minute was passed:

"It may be expected that the Conference should make some observations on the death of Mr. Wesley, but they find themselves utterly unable to express their ideas and feelings on this awful and affecting event. Their souls do truly mourn for their great loss; and they trust they shall give the most substantial proofs of their veneration for the memory of their much-esteemed father and friend, by endeavouring, though with great humility and diffidence, to follow and imitate him in doctrine, discipline and life."†

The simplicity of this record is full of the deepest pathos. His truest epitaph is the sentence which he twice repeated with his dying lips: "THE BEST OF ALL IS, GOD IS WITH US."

JOHN GORDON.

---

* Wakeley's Anecdotes of the Wesleys, p. 163.
† Myles's Chronological History, p. 149.

VI.—THE RECOVERY OF JERUSALEM.

The Recovery of Jerusalem. London: Bentley. 1871.

The Palestine Exploration Fund is described on the back of each of the Quarterly Statements as "A Society for the accurate and systematic investigation of the Archæology, Topography, Geology and Physical Geography, Natural History, Manners and Customs, of the Holy Land, for Biblical Illustration." After a feeling of momentary surprise that a "Fund" and a "Society" should be treated as synonymous terms, our readers will be prepared to take an interest in a Society, or to contribute to a Fund, established with so important an object, if indeed they have not already done so.

"The original stimulus to the whole undertaking was supplied by the benevolent wish of Miss Burdett Coutts to ascertain the best means of bringing water to the thirsty city;"* and out of this have arisen a work and a literature so various as to include an Ordnance survey of Palestine and Jerusalem, and the Report of them by Engineer Officers,† and various collections of Beetles, and a Report on *them*.‡ Investigations covering so wide a field require and deserve a great deal of money; loose Quarterly Papers are not freely bought by the general public, and are apt to become mere litter in the studies of those who receive them gratis, in spite of the undoubted value of a portion of their contents. Hence there has arisen a need of devising "some means of summing up and popularizing the main results obtained." The volume in question is the means, and to this more peaceful crusade and its record is applied the whole warlike watchword, "The Recovery of Jerusalem." Were we to judge this simply as a larger "Quarterly Statement," there would be little to say; we should wait patiently till more was given; but taken as a book, it is disappointing and unsatisfactory; it is still more so as a statement of results, if by "results" are meant any real light shed on the Bible and the early history of Christianity. What the public would have been thankful for is a digest of all that

---

* Introduction, p. xvi.

† Recovery of Jerusalem, p. 3.

‡ Quarterly Statement, No. IV.

has been done in all departments, declaring what has been settled positively or negatively, rather than the reports and letters, some of which are also printed in the "Statements," which are, after all, only the raw material of a book. Such, we take it, was the plan of those who arranged the publication of a volume. "It had been originally intended that it should be edited by the Honorary Officers of the Fund, but the pressure of other labours threw this duty on one of the Treasurers,"* who is not of course to be held responsible for the shortcomings of a work not in the first place arranged by himself. Then as to the contributors: "It is due to Captain Warren to state that his interesting and valuable narrative has been drawn up under heavy pressure, owing to shortness of time and ill-health."† "Ill-health has prevented Mr. Deutsch from contributing an essay on the Moabite Stone, as had been originally contemplated."‡ Mr. Greville Chester and Mr. Phené Spiers have prepared their "valuable contributions" "at very short notice." The Count de Vogüé had not finished, and has not been able to revise his paper.§ All these were reasons for delay; there is no excuse sufficient for the book as it is given to us, unless the need of money be one, and money no doubt it will bring. The title is taking, and the volume will sell but not live. The Dean of Westminster has evidently felt the difficulties of his sponsorship. He has next to nothing to say; it need scarcely be said that the little is said gracefully. But in his summary of what the book will be found to contain, he gives ample ground for wishing there had been a longer pause. "The course of the ancient walls still remains unsolved;" "the controversy respecting the Temple Area is still *sub judice*." The papers printed make us wish this still more strongly.

Captain Warren's part in the Jerusalem excavations seems to have been extremely well done; and his account would probably be full of detailed interest to all with requisite scientific knowledge to enable them to realize his difficulties. Besides the usual stubbornness and stupidity of the Easterns with whom he had to deal, there were serious and peculiar mechanical hindrances to his work. We Franks are perhaps not quite tolerant enough of Eastern

---

* Editor's Preface, p. viii. † P. vi. ‡ Ibid. § P. vii.

obstinacy, and ought to try and imagine what the feelings of his Grace the Archbishop of York would be if a deputation of Jews asked leave to examine and tunnel under the walls of his Minster for a treasure they had reason to believe was buried there by Isaac of York, before we wonder at the opposition, active and passive, to our mining operations. The physical or mechanical difficulties arose in part from the nature of the soil. "We were working," says Captain Warren, "in the *debris* of ancient cities, where the shingle is found to run like water, and the great masses of cut stone will crunch up a mining case in a trice."* "To shew how difficult it (the shingle) was to work in, I may state that we tapped an old tank, with a hole not twelve inches square, and yet the shingle flowed out of this for several days, until the tank was nearly empty (we were of course carrying it off from below the fall), and as it was flowing, it came so fast that it resembled more a cataract of water than of stone."†

But this, after all, is what children call "clean dirt,"—is scarcely more perilous and far more easy to undergo than the hindrances under which Captain Warren explored a drain under the Convent of the Sisters of Sion. "I looked into this passage, and found it to open out to a width of four feet, and to be full of sewage five feet deep. . . . Seeing how desirable it would be to trace out this passage, I obtained three old doors, and went down there to-day with Sergeant Birtles; we laid them down on the surface of the sewage, and advanced by lifting up the hindermost and throwing it in front of us....In some places, the sewage was exceedingly moist and very offensive, and it was difficult to keep our balance while getting up the doors after they had sunk in the mud...Everything had become so slippery that we had to exercise great caution in lowering ourselves down, lest an unlucky false step might cause a header into the murky liquid."‡ And the result of all this wading and groping is the discovery, interesting indeed, that the old walls of Jerusalem are of enormous height, but next to nothing of real value to biblical students. A secret passage is found, "but it does not appear that its construction is of so ancient a date as the time of David or even of

* P. 58. † P. 64. ‡ P. 139.

Herod."* Such discoveries as are made are of walls "built by the Crusaders," "gateway of early construction," whose "style is Roman," and so on; interesting, but not more so than archæological diggings anywhere else, which are done without "so great cry and so little wool." In fact, what Captain Warren says of his excavations at Muristan is true of the whole—"The general result was unsatisfactory."†

It is to be regretted that the excavations were not always conducted with perfect fairness, and that forbidden ground was approached by a dodge which Englishmen would certainly resent if the same things were done to them. Captain Warren says:

"After we were driven away from the Sanctuary wall.... I sunk a shaft thirty-seven feet to south of south-east angle, and to this no objection could be made, as it was just without the line given to me. My object was to sink down, and then drive into the Sanctuary wall, and run along it. At that time our powers of mining were quite unknown. . . . My object was to get up to the wall, have published the results, get copies sent to the Porte, then to come nearer to the wall and sink a shaft; and when ordered away to resist passively, asserting that we had already been working alongside the wall from underneath, that the matter was published, known to the world and to the Porte, and that it was now an established custom, for custom is almost a law in this part of Turkey."‡

Whatever engineering skill and perseverance could effect was done, nor was there want of religious zeal. Captain Warren seems to have been sincerely anxious to identify, where possible, places mentioned in the sacred narrative. And he has a very remarkable view of the arrangements made by God in order that the Temple might stand where, according to him, it actually was placed, against which situation we have nothing to say. He fixes the site, and then disposes of a possible objection. "It certainly may be said that the site was not selected for a fortress, and that its position depended on that of the threshing-floor of Araunah; but it seems reasonable to suppose that Divine Providence would have caused the threshing-floor to have been placed in such a position as would have been after-

---

* P. 91. † P. 271. ‡ P. 287.

wards favourable to the dominance of the Temple"!* We wonder if people would take such views of God's dealings if they called Him by His Name, instead of disguising Him under such periphrastic terms as Divine Providence.

Captain Warren's narrative fills the larger portion of the book, as it has already in our notice. We pass to Captain Wilson's paper on the Sea of Galilee. It is easy to understand that there is no region so likely to foster a feeling of devout sentiment as the shores and hill-sides on which so large a part of the life of Jesus was spent. How much such devout sentiment conduces to or detracts from a robust religion may be doubted, but it will be more encouraged by Galilee than even by the great city where he was crucified. The reason is not far to seek. Every sacred site in Jerusalem is obviously up to this time a mere matter of legend, and probably nothing but a second and truer invention of the Cross, no person save a second St. Helena, could fix any single locality. Moreover, each is identified with some one of rival religions, if it is not the very battle-ground of more than one. Unholy strife has denuded the places of much of their ancient sanctity. But at Galilee the traveller is less tied to legend, and the scenes appear, to judge from what travellers tell us, full of the influence of those early days of Jesus' life which inspire M. Renan's idyl. To endeavour to identify Capernaum or Magdala or Chorazin, may certainly give a point to a traveller's wanderings, and the result may be interesting, even if it does not affect biblical criticism one way or the other. But legitimate identification will surely stop short of endeavouring to bolster up a twelfth-century legend of the Mount on which the Sermon was delivered,—of claiming "a level grassy spot" as the scene of the miraculous feeding of the five thousand, and "a steep, even slope as the 'steep place' down which the herd of swine ran violently into the sea and so were choked." Captain Wilson enters into this point somewhat fully, because "even such a carefully compiled work as the Dictionary of the Bible has made the extraordinary blunder of placing the scene of the miracle at Gadara, now Um Keis, a place from which the swine would have had a hard gallop of two hours before reaching the lake."† Now if Um Keis is

---

* P. 315. † P. 369.

Gadara, the "extraordinary blunder" is made also in the Gospels according to Luke and John, and we are constrained to admit fully the truth of the Dean of Westminster's assertion, "There is another point on which it has been extremely difficult to arrive at any fixed conclusion—the scene of the demoniacs and the swine."*

It is still more difficult to believe that the Dean is speaking seriously. Are we to suppose that he believes that two thousand devils entered into two thousand swine, or even that a certain number of devils entered into the leading swine—in fact, that the whole affair is literally true as narrated in either of the narratives? If so, the slight element of wonder which is added by the "hard gallop of two hours" is scarcely worth mentioning; but all that is involved in such belief should be carefully weighed. If the story be not literally true, then, whatever be its ideological worth, it is in part or wholly mythical, and it is clearly absurd to try and identify a place at which occurred that which, as told us, never did occur. We cannot hope to discover the basis, if any, of historic truth from the physical features of this or that spot in Palestine. The same argument will apply with equal force to several other sites of miraculous transactions.

Lieut. Anderson's unassuming paper on the Survey of Palestine has real literary merit, is extremely clear and interesting, and, short as it is, throws some light on the Bible. He describes the sort of pit which is evidently intended in Genesis as that in which Joseph was imprisoned, and makes us *see*, to mention only two points, the operations of a band of locusts and the aspect of a company of lepers.

But when he or any other traveller attempts to find any proof of the truth of Scripture narrative in the fact that the physical appearance of the locality agrees with the written text, they overlook the objection that it is quite as possible, or in some cases far more probable, that the story attached itself to a locality previously well known. All would smile at any attempt to argue for the truth of Sir Thomas Mallory's Morte d'Arthur, because the Vale of Avalon (or Glastonbury) or Caerleon or Usk may still possibly be identified with well known spots; but to suppose that the history

---

* P. xx.

of Abraham or the account of the giving of the Law is strengthened by the discovery of the position of Bethel or of the true Sinai, is a specimen of precisely the same fallacy. Mr. Holland keeps within the bounds of fair argument when he says that the Ordnance survey of the peninsula of Sinai has firmly established "that the physical conditions of the country are such as to render it quite possible that the events recorded in the book of Exodus occurred there;" but there is a general tacit assumption in Palestinian tourists, and sometimes a positive assertion, that the proof goes far beyond this. But when off their guard, the same tourists often shew us how the legend has grown out of or attached itself to the physical aspects of the country. Captain Warren gives, in one of the Quarterly Statements, an account of a "Visit to the Dead Sea," and in it we find the following passage:

"We passed on by the curious hill of salt, and exclaimed, 'Lot's wife,' a very large pillar of salt, something like the figure out of a Noah's ark.....As we were moving campwards and were talking of 'Lot's wife,' the attention of all three was suddenly attracted. We saw before us among the pinnacles of salt a gigantic Lot, with a daughter on each arm, hurrying off in a south-westerly direction, their bodies bent forward as though they were in great haste, and their flowing garments trailing behind."*

Of the Moabite Stone, the one important discovery which has been made in Palestine, we shall say next to nothing. Various letters in the *Times* have told us nearly all there is yet to know, and Mr. Deutsch, of all men most competent to tell us more and sum up the gains to science, advises "the learned and the public at large to hold their hand for a brief space yet," because "so long as there is any hope of the recovery of one single scrap of material" (of the broken stone), "so long must the final investigations remain in abeyance." We trust that, when the time shall seem to him suitable, Mr. Deutsch will give the world his views on the whole subject.

The result of our examination of the book, as our readers will perceive from the above summary, is disappointing. The Palestine Exploration is a meritorious and interesting work, even if it be not all that its promoters claim for it.

---

* Quarterly Statement, No. IV. pp. 149, 150.

It is possible that it might lose in funds if it were absolutely cleared from cant, and this is therefore a conclusion scarce to be expected, however devoutly to be wished. But we may venture to express the hope that any companion volume to the present may be more worthy of the literary fame of many of the distinguished names connected with the Society. It is grievous in the trade of letters, as in all other trades, when work is "scamped" for the sake of gain, even when such gain is urgently needed.

C. Kegan Paul

VII.—NOTICES OF BOOKS.

An Examination of Canon Liddon's Bampton Lectures on the Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. By A Clergyman of the Church of England. London: Trübner. 1871.

The Bible and Popular Theology: a Re-statement of Truths and Principles, with special reference to recent Works of Dr. Liddon, Lord Hatherley, the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, and others. By G. Vance Smith, B.A., Ph.D. London: Longmans. 1871.

A "Clergyman of the Church of England" has given us a most clear and conclusive refutation of Dr. Liddon's thesis, that the dogma of the Deity of Christ is supported by the teaching of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures. The Clergyman's trenchant logic plays sad havoc with the Canon's special-pleading and rhetorical embellishments; and should the neat little book we are noticing come (as we trust it will) into close comparison with its more portly rival on the study table of many a thoughtful ecclesiastic, we feel no doubt that, in some cases at least, the bulky volume will be replaced upon the shelf with serious misgivings as to its argumentative value, and the muttered anathema, *μέγα βιβλίον μέγα κακόν.* But, from an outsider's point of view, it really does seem cruel, that no sooner has the eloquent defender of orthodoxy elaborately compounded a well-sugared anodyne, which was to quiet for all time the

uneasy questionings and bitter sceptical pangs to which the clerical mind is constitutionally subject, than a humbler member of the same household of faith, instead of thankfully swallowing the dose, deliberately sets to work to analyze the Doctor's patent medicine, and points out that it is to a large extent composed of those well-known but noxious drugs, called baseless assumptions, which can only lull the present anguish at the cost of undermining and poisoning the whole intellectual life. We doubted, accordingly, at first, whether the author was a bonâ-fide member of the Anglican Church; but after a further reading of his book, these doubts have grown weaker: though what business he has there is best known to himself, for to us he is one of the most mysterious of theological nondescripts. He has certainly attacked most successfully Dr. Liddon's position, that the Bible teaches the Deity of Jesus, and his book may well rank with the best Unitarian treatises on this subject. But does our author himself disbelieve the doctrine of the Deity of Christ? That is not so clear. His view appears to be, that though the Bible alone does not afford an adequate basis for the dogma, yet that it has been left to "a revealing Church, to whose guardianship Christian doctrine has for all time been committed," to develop this and kindred germs contained in the Scriptures. We may be wrong in supposing that he is here expressing his own opinion; but there cannot be the slightest doubt that he believes the Protestant basis of the English Church to be radically illogical and unsound: she must either resign her favourite dogmas, or else cease to pretend that these dogmas rest upon a Biblical foundation. The author thus confirms what has long been evident to reflective minds, that there is no self-consistent *via media* between Roman Catholicism, which rests religious truth upon the ever-present *external* authority of a Church, and that Unitarianism, synonymous with Christian Theism, which rests it upon the ever-present *internal* authority of the Holy Spirit inspiring the reason, the conscience and the affections of each individual soul. With which of these parties our clear-headed "Clergyman of the Church of England" will throw in his lot seems somewhat dubious; but he can hardly remain long in a house which he himself has so clearly shewn to be built upon the sand.

Curiously enough, the volume we have just noticed stands in quite a fraternal relation to a book of like ability and scholarship from the pen of Dr. Vance Smith, the worthy representative of the Unitarians upon the Biblical Revision Committee. Dr. Smith's work has a wider scope than that embraced by Canon Liddon's Lectures, and fully discusses some topics only incidentally touched upon in the latter work. The main purpose of the author evidently is to modify and strengthen the Unitarian lines of defence, with special reference to recent attacks upon them by Dr. Liddon, Lord Hatherley, Dr. Thomson and others. The volume in question exhibits in a marked degree Dr. Smith's excellences of thought and style. Transparent but not shallow, learned but not pedantic, with now and then a charming touch of quiet humour or good-natured sarcasm, it bears upon every page the traces of a scholarly and well-trained mind, and of a truly catholic spirit calmly reposing on those eternal verities whose foundations lie too deep to be disturbed by any questions of Biblical criticism. Unlike many of his predecessors who have laboured in the same field, Dr. Smith regards textual arguments as of much interest, but by no means as involving the fate of grand spiritual truths. Earlier Unitarians, holding with more or less tenacity to the Protestant notion that the Bible, and not the spiritual nature of man, is the final court of appeal on matters theological, naturally waxed very warm in the war of texts, and were, we think, in the heat of controversy sometimes guilty of their opponents' error of twisting Scripture to suit their own doctrinal requirements. Dr. Smith has attained to a point of vision whence he can tranquilly review this textual strife with the critical eye of an accomplished scholar, combined with the spiritual insight of a kindly and religious soul. Reverently and affectionately does he speak of the Scriptures, for he has studied them alike critically and lovingly, and he knows too well their intrinsic excellence to be tempted to make unreal and extravagant claims on their behalf. He points out clearly the development of theological knowledge, as prophetic vision increases, and enlarged intellectual culture gives higher modes of expression to devout feeling ; but he sets no rigid limit to the unfolding of divine truth, nor does he shrink from severing what he feels to be extraneous and erroneous from what is

essential and eternal in the teachings of those whom he reveres and loves the most. In dealing with the Logos doctrine of the Fourth Gospel, and with the sacrificial phraseology employed by Paul, Dr. Smith describes clearly, and we think with no little originality of thought, the peculiar circumstances of the age, and the speculative tendencies which favoured the formation of these views; and without committing himself to the acceptance of them, he shews that they embodied, though in an imperfect and partial way, truths which are of universal significance. We think, however, that the value of the book would have been somewhat enhanced to the liberal inquirer, if the author had pointed out more explicitly than he has done, that it is these vague expressions in Paul and John which furnish the nucleus round which the Nicene doctrines gradually gathered; so that in tracing Trinitarian error to its sources, we must not be satisfied with following back the stream through the earlier fathers, but must seek the fountain-head within the limits of the Canonical Scriptures. This, however, is work for some future student. Meanwhile, we heartily recommend Dr. Smith's book to those who wish to form a true estimate of the Biblical writings, and who are prepared to follow the guidance of a judicious and impartial scholar, rather than to give heed to the one-sided pleading of the professional advocate, or the indiscriminate eulogies of the impassioned devotee.

CHARLES B. UPTON.

Reasons for returning to the Church of England. London: Strahan and Co. 1871.

The Contemporary Review, May, 1871. *Article on "The Yoke of the Articles and Prayer Book."* By the Rev. J. M. Capes.

Freedom in the Church of England: Six Sermons suggested by the Voysey Judgment, &c. By the Rev. Stopford A. Brooke. London: King. 1871.

Letter from the Dean of Westminster to a Friend. Published in the "Guardian" Newspaper, May 3, 1871.

The public attention, at this moment of ecclesiastical crisis, is much more concentrated upon the High-church than upon the Broad-church phase of the embroglio. Mr.

Voysey has been deprived, and there, for the most part, is the end of the matter; but what will be the result of the Purchas Judgment, which the Queen has at last accepted and confirmed,—whether the Bishops will enforce the law, whether Evangelical Deans will wear copes, whether Anglican incumbents will suffer the spoiling of their goods sooner than consecrate at the north end,—everybody is waiting to know; and meanwhile there is no lack of swelling words, which may or may not mean much. Still it is felt on all sides that the heat of this controversy will not be reached until the decision in Mr. Bennet's case is given: in comparison with the question as to whether the doctrine of the Real Presence can be lawfully held in the Church of England, all matters of vestment and ritual, whatever their weight of symbolic meaning, sink into comparative insignificance. But while we wait for the development of the drama on this side, it may be worth while to notice one or two utterances which have either been called forth by the Voysey Judgment or stand in an obvious connection with it. They have, we venture to think, little real importance; for the irresistible logic of events is every day diminishing the influence of the liberal clergy and discrediting their theory of comprehension; but they have an interest of their own as records of a phase of intellectual and moral conviction which, soon to pass away, will greatly excite the wonder of some not distant generation.

The first book on our list, "Reasons for returning to the Church of England," is, though published anonymously, known to be the work of the Rev. J. M. Capes, a gentleman who, having embraced Roman Catholicism twenty-five years ago, remained in that communion (if we combine his dates rightly) thirteen years, and then, after twelve years of ecclesiastical isolation, has just re-entered the Church of England under the friendly auspices of Mr. Stopford Brooke. His book, the work of a cultivated and thoughtful mind, may very likely add much to the scanty knowledge of the Catholic Church possessed by ordinary Protestant readers. He tells us first how, proceeding on the assumption that there must somewhere be an infallible interpreter of revelation, he was led to the almost inevitable conclusion that that interpreter is the Church of Rome; and that then, after some years, finding reason to abandon his assumption, all

the superstructure of belief which he had erected upon it fell hopelessly to the ground. He states his argument both for and against Rome with perfect fairness and great insight; but, with an anonymous critic in the Dublin Review, we are disposed to believe that in the truest sense of the words he never was a Catholic at all, or at least that, like Mr. Ffoulkes, he had not so far divested his mind of the clothing of Protestant ideas, as to be thoroughly comfortable in the atmosphere of his new home. All this part of his book, however, is instructive and suggestive; the unsatisfactory part begins when he endeavours to explain why he abandoned the condition of solitary independence, in which he remained for twelve years, to re-enter upon ministerial work in the Church of England. The publication of the dogma of Papal Infallibility locked and barred the door by which he might possibly (so he seems to wish his readers to infer) have found his way back to Rome; while, on the other hand, recent legal events have broadened and liberalized the English Church; though how these two forces, apparently working in opposite directions, can have combined to produce one result, is a curious problem in moral mechanics. And Mr. Capes looks upon the Church of England, though "a vast anomaly," as "a working institution on an immense scale." No one would be fool enough to set it up; but there it is, and it answers. "Solvitur ambulando." "To myself then," he continues,* "the practical question arises, whether, now that Rome has pledged herself to a propagation of that most demoralizing system of morals and devotion which is known as Ultramontanism, it is not well that I should give such little support as I can offer, for what remains to me of life, to an institution which seems the most powerful body in Christian England for the propagation of the elementary principles of Christianity." So Mr. Capes returns, a late prodigal, to the mother whom in his youth he left for the meretricious attractions of Rome.

Whether the statement of reasons made in this little book was felt to be unsatisfactory by Mr. Capes himself or by his friends, we cannot say; but he has given it a supplement in a very remarkable paper in the Contemporary Review of May 1st, entitled, "The Yoke of the Articles

---

* P. 191.

and Prayer Book." The current theories of subscription, he says, are unsatisfactory ; he will attempt to furnish a better. So he proceeds to point out in the plainest, we had almost said the most sarcastic language, how the Order of Baptism pledges the priest who uses it, in the clearest and closest way, to a belief in baptismal regeneration ; and how, nevertheless, it was ruled in the Gorham case that Evangelical clergymen, to whom regeneration is only and always a spiritual process, might lawfully use it. So, drawing from this fact the conclusion that formularies, however precise in their terms, may legally be held to mean the very opposite of what they seem to mean, he proceeds to the cases of the Order for the Visitation of the Sick, of the Ordination Service, and of the Athanasian Creed, shewing that large sections of the clergy do not accept their doctrinal statements, and that in the last-named case it is impossible to draw a reasonable distinction between the words "person" and "substance," especially if their original be considered in connection with their present signification. Nothing then is left but to consider the Articles as Articles of peace. The clergyman* "must embrace the one intelligible theory that there is a distinction to be recognized between holding and publishing his own peculiar personal tenets." "When he subscribes, therefore, he undertakes not to impugn the manifest meaning of the Articles and Services where he believes that meaning to be really manifest ; and in undertaking to use the Services in public worship, he accepts them as the existing formularies of the institution in which he ministers, and not as necessarily implying his own individual acquiescence in all the doctrines which they assert or imply." Mr. Capes goes on, not unnaturally, to say : "I am aware that this last admission is very distasteful to many minds. Nor do I pretend that it can be otherwise than disagreeable to a seriously thinking person to use words against whose obvious meaning his whole nature rebels." "It is not a pleasant process, even as a mouth-piece, to have to utter forms of prayer which one thinks embody unsound doctrine, and to which one is all the while giving a non-natural sense." Still it is necessary ; the very idea of public worship implies such concessions on the part of individuals as

---

* Pp. 234, 235.

these. "If any clergyman is supposed to be uttering his own views every time he reads prayers, the whole edifice of the Church must tumble to the ground." Nor is even this the whole. "By the act of subscription a clergyman only binds himself to abstain from certain modes of impugning the doctrine of the formularies. He is not compelled altogether to hold his tongue whenever he dissents from the doctrine. Still it would surely be a scandal if he went out of his way to attack any dogma from which he inwardly dissents." "He ought to teach his own views without drawing any attention to their inconsistency with the appointed Offices of the Church." And the conclusion of the whole matter is: "If it is urged that such a method of proceeding is not open and straightforward, I reply that it is as much so as circumstances will allow."*

We sincerely thank Mr. Capes for putting the matter in this clear, naked, cynical way. His thoughts are only the thoughts of hundreds more, who rarely formulate their convictions as distinctly and logically as he has done. "To be as open and straightforward as circumstances will allow," is a maxim by which establishments have been kept up and abuses sustained ever since Christianity was first organized; but we have never before heard it from the lips of those who would reform the Church, and somehow we cannot translate it into the German of Luther, much less express it in the Greek of Paul. Were we afflicted with the Jesuitophobia which seems only to attack Evangelical minds, we might suggest that Mr. Capes yet hides the Ignatian garb beneath his "decent surplice," and, like the U. P. Church, according to Mr. Disraeli's audacious theory, he is an instrument in the hands of Rome for the division and destruction of Protestantism.

Mr. Stopford Brooke's Sermons on the Voysey Judgment, though apparently hasty, and deficient in form and symmetry, stand on a very different moral level. In a discourse which, though printed at the beginning, was preached at the end of the series, he develops his theory of the Church, which he thinks ought, for the sake of life and motion and sincerity, to hold all forms of religious belief consistent with the reception of a few cardinal doctrines, the matter of

* P. 236.

which, though not the form, is defined in the Articles and Creeds. How far this is the true ideal of a National Church is one question; how far it corresponds to the facts of the Church of England, quite another. We have certainly been under the impression that the term, "a few cardinal doctrines,"* would very insufficiently describe the somewhat elaborate system of faith drawn up by the Reformers; and though the Articles contain loop-holes, which we believe to have been for the most part unintentionally left, we thought that in the main they were remarkable for their strict definition of the form as well as of the matter of doctrine. Mr. Brooke, however, thinks differently; and after a stroug adjuration to the laity—part attack, part appeal (for he has made the remarkable discovery that "there is no body of men more united than the body of English clergy,"† and that the blame of present acrimony in controversy rests chiefly with "the religious laity"‡)—he goes on in five sermons, on the Atonement, Original Sin, and Freedom of Biblical Criticism, to defend his personal position in regard to the Voysey Judgment. Here we shall not follow him. He has done a wise and an honest thing in thus speaking out upon these agitated topics to his own hearers. "To some," he says in his Preface, "these Sermons will seem too orthodox, to others the contrary; but I trust that all will recognize in them my sincere adherence to the great doctrines of the Divinity of Christ, of the necessity of a revelation and an Atonement for sin." Mr. Brooke will probably continue to enjoy the honour of being a mark for the pious shafts of the Record, but his heresy must be much more pronounced than it is before he can attain the additional distinction of a prosecution.

To this list we add a Letter, addressed by Dean Stanley to some friend, and subsequently published in the Guardian. He had been asked, "what he considered to be the effect of the late Judgment in the case of Mr. Voysey on the position of the clergy who do agree more or less with any of the positions which that Judgment appears to condemn." The answer is, "The Judgments of the Privy Council, in the case alike of Mr. Voysey and Mr. Purchas, do but bring to light contradictions which existed already."

---

* P. 7. † P. 11. ‡ P. 18.

If the Articles and the Rubrics were strictly enforced, who could remain in the Church? "They are not enforced, because there is a general atmosphere of common sense and common charity in which we have hitherto lived, and which forbids their general application." So the law of the Church is really the same after, as it was before, these Judgments; and no one who has been comfortable in the ministry hitherto need distress himself now, until he is disturbed by lawful authority. "The Bishops, if invoked, have no other option but so to enforce the Judgments. But the position of the clergy themselves remains the same as it was before, until such Judgment is enforced; and then, as in all cases of the unexpected revival of a law (whether civil or ecclesiastical) supposed to be quiescent, they have no option but to obey, or to procure the alteration of the law. Common sense and public duty, as Lord Stafford said, warn us, 'not to rattle up these sleeping lions.' When they are 'rattled up,' it is equally our wisdom and our duty to confine their ravages within the smallest possible limits."

So the Broad-church clergy are in this happy position towards the National Church and the law of the land: if any heretic, of any complexion, is tried and acquitted, it broadens the basis of the Church; and, strangely enough, if he is condemned, it does not "materially alter the general position of the English clergy." It is impossible to get a verdict against them. Dr. Williams' acquittal does them good, and Mr. Voysey's deprivation, no harm. The one thing it is impossible to touch is their contented conformity.

CHARLES BEARD.

Memoir of the Rev. Thomas Madge, late Minister of Essex Street Chapel, London. By the Rev. William James. London: Longmans. 1871.

Mr. James' affectionate and judicious Memoir of Mr. Madge will be read with great pleasure by all who ever had the happiness of being acquainted with its subject, either as a preacher or a friend. To other readers it makes comparatively little appeal; for Mr. Madge's life was uneventful, nor did he ever put forward any claim to be considered a leader of religious thought. Just now, however, when we are so constantly being told that the abolition

of patronage in the Church must lead to relations between minister and people which inevitably degrade the one and demoralize the other, it may be instructive to those whose ideas of Nonconformist religious life are chiefly derived from the caricature pictures of modern novelists, to see how full of true peace and dignity the existence of a Dissenting minister can be; how the very play and freedom of relations between the teacher and the taught, understood and used by fine natures on either side, may issue in the warmest affection and the most delicate respect; how it is possible for a man to be the elect of his congregation, without in the least ceasing to be the eager apostle of truth and the devoted servant of the church. The connection between minister and people has in it something of the nature of wedlock: marriages of convenience, where, as in France, the parties are brought together chiefly at the will of parents or friends, may under favourable circumstances settle down into a relation both useful and comfortable; but to produce the highest results possible to the union of two lives, there must be free choice and mutual attraction.

The events of Mr. Madge's life are soon told. He was born at Plymouth in 1786; and losing his father when quite young, was adopted by a relative, a surgeon, at Crediton, who designed him for his assistant and successor. The boy was educated at the Crediton Grammar School, where he greatly distinguished himself. Circumstances, which need not here be detailed, directed his inclinations to the ministry among the English Presbyterians, who were then beginning to pass from Arian to Unitarian opinions; and his kind and liberal guardian, though himself a Churchman, interposed no hindrance in his way. Mr. Madge at first studied under the Rev. Timothy Kenrick, of Exeter, who presided over an Academy in which young men were educated for the ministry; and then, upon the death of his tutor, transferred himself to Manchester College, York, which had then just begun to enjoy the benefit of Mr. Wellbeloved's superintendence. Here he remained for four years, accepting at the end of his course an invitation to Bury St. Edmunds, whither he went at the beginning of the year 1810. His promise as a preacher was already so marked, that he was not allowed to remain long at Bury; in 1812, he was chosen minister of the Octagon Chapel, Norwich,

a situation which he retained for thirteen years. In 1825, he removed to London, to fill the office of assistant and colleague to Mr. Belsham, in the well-known chapel in Essex Street, Strand, so closely and honourably associated with the name of its founder, the Rev. Theophilus Lindsey. Owing to rapidly increasing infirmity, Mr. Belsham did not often officiate after Mr. Madge's settlement in London; and in 1829, the latter became in form, what he had before been in fact, sole minister of the place. For thirty years more he continued to preach, with undiminished honour and usefulness; and even after his retirement in 1859, was often seen in the pulpit of his successor. From this time till his death in 1870, his life was very peaceful and bright. His domestic relations, though he had overlived much trouble, were of the happiest; his interest in all that had ever occupied his mind or warmed his heart was undiminished; he was held in universal affection and respect; and the progress of bodily decay was slow and painless. An honourable and useful life was followed by a gentle decline and a quiet death.

If this outline be filled up with the usual incidents in the life of a successful preacher, who is also not without literary activity, Mr. Madge's story will have been told. But it will still be little more than an outline; and it is hard to sum up in few words the personal impression which has been revived by Mr. James' appreciative Memoir. Mr. Madge was a thinker and a preacher belonging to a school which is now beginning to be thought old; that is to say, he naturally threw his exhortations into forms that were suggested by the ideas and controversies of a past generation. He laid great stress upon the external evidences in favour of religion and Christianity; he was a firm believer, not only in the reality, but in the argumentative force of miracles; and his last literary effort was a short paper on the Design-argument, which he contributed to the pages of this Review. So his preaching had not the *subjective* tone of these latter days; it was chiefly concerned with broad principles of action, general views of Christian doctrine and morality. His sermons were written in clear, nervous English, not without due rhetorical ornament and amplification; and delivered in a voice whose charm still lingers in every ear upon which it fell. But the essential force of

his eloquence lay in his intense earnestness. Whatever he said, he thoroughly believed and felt; about that, there could be no mistake. It was likely enough that, though never wanting in courtesy to an opponent, and never taking an unfair advantage, he did not fully apprehend the strength of the hostile position: the man who can see all round a subject can hardly be passionately interested in any single aspect of it. Still his earnestness had no narrowness in it; and it is hard to conceive how any listener, though differing never so widely from him in opinion, could fail to respect and admire the fine old man, who, true to the convictions of his youth, was still preaching them with unabated fire, and yet without a word that could wound a foe. And it was this, we think, which explains Mr. Madge's continued hold upon the young, whose minds were naturally setting in an opposite direction from his own, and were therefore hardly likely to find in his preaching the attraction of brilliant novelty. They could not imagine that what they heard was a lesson learned by rote, or the echo of old convictions, or anything but the living voice of the preacher, coming from a living heart. And in all that concerns the administration of religion, the sense of a generous and deep enthusiasm is at once powerful to overbear the recollection of superficial difference, and to kindle a genuine sympathy.

But, in truth, there was to the last a childlike quality in Mr. Madge that was inexpressibly engaging. In spite of his powers, the thought of his services and his fame, the simple dignity of his calling, which shone in his face and bearing, there were many things for which he leaned upon others as a child leans. He had attained the peace of old age without its calmness; he could be fretted and enthusiastic about little things like the youngest of his friends; and attracted from those who were far beneath him in age and standing, a love which had something of protection, as well as much of veneration, in it. He was *eager* in a way that is very uncommon in old men; but it was for the progress of some great principle, the success of some religious organization, the triumph of some cause to which he had been attached from his youth. It was very characteristic that almost in the last year of his life he should plunge into the controversy as to the authenticity of the fourth Gospel,

and that not merely in the repetition of the old arguments, but with a resolute endeavour to add something to their number and their cogency. To any kindly heart, this child-likeness in Mr. Madge awakened but one recollection, and that of the word, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." There was such a simplicity and directness in his piety, it was so entirely free from undertones of doubt or misgiving, it gave such a singleness and transparency to his whole nature, as to make it singularly attractive; he was a living argument for Christianity, making its appeal not to the laws of the reason, but to the instincts of the heart.

Our own intimate acquaintance with Mr. Madge was principally confined to the latter years, of which we have tried to delineate the spirit. And most of those who knew him in his youth and middle life are with him. Still the memory of a good man, and especially of a true preacher, never passes away, though it may lapse into unconsciousness; if it is the shadow upon a preacher's work that he must soon be forgotten, as the living voice dies into silence and the old lessons are reproduced in fresher forms, it is also his reward that, though it is impossible to trace the effect and measure the force of his words in hearts moved and consciences quickened, the unseen energy may pervade a whole life, and even overleap the chasm which divides one generation from the next. Those who knew Mr. Madge best will be readiest to thank Mr. James for his excellent Memoir; to them it will be like the magic fluid which brings out upon the surface of the plate the impressions which the light had left behind, and which, but for it, were, like all human recollections, slowly but surely fading into forgetfulness.

CHARLES BEARD.

Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100). By E. A. Sophocles. Boston: Little, Brown and Co. 1870.

Professor Sophocles, who has already won himself an honoured name by his labours on the same field, supplies us in this volume with a Lexicon of the Greek language during the period of its protracted decay. In an interesting and on the whole well-written Introduction, he divides the

history of the Greek language into six periods: the Mythical (in which we may notice, in passing, that it is somewhat strange to find a mention of the remains of Pamphus, and none of those of Musæus), the Ionic, the Attic, the Alexandrian, the Roman and the Byzantine. The last he subdivides into a first (A.D. 330—622), a second (A.D. 622—1099) and a third (A.D. 1099—1453) epoch. It is for the Roman period and the first and second epochs of the Byzantine period that Professor Sophocles offers himself as our guide. But unfortunately he does so without a word of preface to explain to us how far he is prepared to make us acquainted with the country. Hence, in considering the merits of his book, it is impossible to say how far deficiencies and omissions are to be ascribed to the plan that he has formed, or to the execution of it. And so the task of criticising the Lexicon (always a difficult one, and requiring rather the familiarity acquired by years of usage, than a necessarily hasty and superficial inspection) is rendered doubly difficult. But so far as we have been able to compare it with other Lexicons, it appears rather a collection of valuable material for a future lexicographer, than an adequate and satisfactory work in itself. Many words are inserted which are not to be found in dictionaries whose object is more general; but, on the other hand, not a few words and significations to be found in the later Greek writers are omitted by Professor Sophocles. By comparing a few columns of his work with the corresponding portions of Liddell and Scott, or Rost and Palm, this would be clearly seen. Words peculiar to writers like Plutarch, Philo, Porphyry or Clement of Alexandria, are found to be omitted; while, on the other hand, Mr. Sophocles has certainly added much to the stores of his predecessors. In the last column, for instance, devoted to the letter Λ, Mr. Sophocles omits the late Greek words, λῶπος, λωπίζω, λωποδυτέω, λωροκάπιστρον, λωροπεδέω, λωτέω, λωφάω; but he inserts λωράμεντον, λωρίζω, λωρικᾶτος, λωρίκιον, λωρίον, λῶρον, λῶρος, λωρύσοκκον, λωρωτός, λωτάριον, and in several instances the added articles are full and lengthy. Those interested in the present controversy on the true pronunciation of the Latin *v*, will find in the Lexicon of Mr. Sophocles plenty of examples of the manner in which it is represented in Greek, available for the support of either of the rival theories; though it is curious to

find, under the head of Βάραγγοι, rendered Barangi, no notice of the common form of their name, Varangi. The work contains also much that will be useful to the student of the Greek fathers, though it can hardly be considered as an adequate guide. Many of their most characteristic words are omitted, though belonging apparently solely to the period with which this Lexicon deals. Nor are the varying meanings of the same word always adequately given; e.g., for εὐυπόληπτος, Mr. Sophocles gives only the meaning, "of good report, enjoying a good reputation," though Eustathius uses it also in the sense of "easy to take up," or "easy to maintain." The additions are mainly in the compounds that are so plentiful in Byzantine Greek, and in the queer-looking adaptations or mere transliterations of Latin words. Great pains have evidently been taken with the references, which are supplied in every case. In the case of the Septuagint they are unusually full and complete; and the discussion of the biblical language generally is one of the most valuable portions of the work. It is difficult to see what rule the compiler has adopted with regard to the insertion of words that are not peculiar to the later stages of the language. Many are omitted, probably as being well known to all who are likely to use the work; but very many are also inserted, where the later usage does not seem to differ at all from the classical meaning. In more instances the omissions are disappointing, as when we find the θηλύπρινος explained by ἀρία *(obscurum per obscurius)*, but the latter word wanting from its place. The typography of the volume on the whole deserves much commendation; it is beautifully "electrotyped and printed" at the Cambridge (U.S.) press; misprints are neither so rare as to win any especial praise for the printer, nor so common as to deserve especial censure. But we trust that it is not a growing custom in America to omit the aspirate over the initial ῥ.

A. S. W.

A Comparative Grammar of the Teutonic Languages; being at the same time an Historical Grammar of the English Language. By James Helfenstein, Ph.D. London: Macmillan. 1870.

Die Gothische Sprache. Ihre Lautgestaltung insbesondere im

Verhältniss zum Altindischen Griechischen und Lateinischen. Von Leo Meyer. Berlin. 1869.

These two contributions to the literature of the science of comparative language seem to have been prepared simultaneously, but without concert; and they differ enough in their objects and methods to make the one a useful supplement to the other. Leo Meyer's book is a valuable addition to the results of his previous hard-working and important services in the cause of philology. Dr. Helfenstein's book is the more interesting of the two to English readers, who will probably be disposed to join in his wish—expressed with pardonable egotism—for the success of a work which he tells them with touching simplicity has for six years been his constant companion in trials and sorrows; and they will at all events testify to his "earnestness and diligence," even though they may not with himself perceive any "deficiency in knowledge and abilities." Modestly estimated by him as an introductory text-book to the study of the works of Jacob Grimm, its English students must often feel tempted to stop short with this attractive-looking volume, grateful if it spares them the necessity of passing on to the four ugly octavos of the celebrated 'Deutsche Grammatik.' It may be feared, however, that the author is too sanguine in holding that "the English public are always ready to promote every work which aims at the advancement of science and art, if conducted with perseverance and earnestness of purpose." If the word "collectively" implies the sense *completely*, Dr. Helfenstein is correct in stating that his own is the first work in English treating of the Teutonic languages collectively. But there are students who owe their first knowledge of Gothic and Anglo-Saxon—the members of this family which most interest us here at home—to the 'Handbook' published by Mr. Clark in 1862;* notwithstanding the want of precision in scholarship complained of at the time in an elaborate criticism in the 'Saturday Review.'†

We wish that the author of a book intended mainly for

---

* The Student's Hand-book of Comparative Grammar, applied to the Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, Latin, Gothic, Anglo-Saxon and English Languages. By Rev. Thomas Clark, M.A. Longman. 1862.

† January 10, 1863.

Englishmen could have avoided the use of German technical terms. Although carefully defined at the outset, such words as "Ablaut," "Umlaut," "Schwächung," must be repulsive (unreasonably it may be) to the eye of a reader unfamiliar with German; and so far is Dr. Helfenstein from assuming a knowledge of modern languages by his readers, that he refers to the respective grammars those who wish to acquire German or Danish for practical purposes. Still more do we regret that the suggested grammatical forms of the so-called primitive Aryan language, or 'Ursprache' of German linguists—itself but a bold conjecture, which there is no evidence was ever spoken through human lips—should have been frequently used, instead of those of Sanskrit, to be compared with and to throw light upon the grammatical forms of the Teutonic languages. Acknowledging too, as he unreservedly does, his indebtedness to Max Müller, we think the author might have added to his clearly written Introduction an explanation of his reasons for adhering—in direct opposition to Max Müller's opinion—to the doctrine of a common Teutonic mother-language. That Dr. Helfenstein holds to the theory that the Goths were of Germanic race and entered Dacia from the northward and westward, is plain enough from his adoption (p. 20) of Schleicher's diagram representing the migrations of the Aryan tribes. This theory is all but unsupported by historical evidence. That an Aryan nation should have returned eastward is *à priori* most improbable; and, in the absence of any complete investigation of the question, we cannot but incline to the simpler, and to our mind more natural hypothesis, that the tribes afterwards called by the Romans Ostro-Goths in Scythia between Tanais and Danaster, and Visi-Goths in Dacia and Pannonia, were descended from the earliest European settlers out of the great Teutonic migration westward, and had never changed their locale.

The statement (p. 6) that the fragmentary translation of the Bible is the only literary document which has come down to us in the Gothic language, is substantially, though not literally, correct. Manifestly translated from a Greek original at a period anterior to the supposed date of any surviving Greek manuscript, this version has given important help to biblical critics. Philologically, it has afforded almost the only materials out of which the grammar and

dictionary of the Gothic language have been constructed. Some years ago, it was reported that certain old manuscripts written in Gothic characters had been discovered in Spain; but more careful inquiry proved that the letters were in the character used for notarial documents in ancient Rome. The language died about the 9th century. Though it left no direct descendant, about one-tenth of the whole number of words in the modern Spanish language are traceable to a Gothic origin.

We commend Dr. Helfenstein's volume to the criticism of scholars and to the use of students. We wish it well through the ordeal of the former: we are sure it will be appreciated by the latter. It is a painstaking and praiseworthy production. Freely adopting the results of the labours of previous investigators (with due and full acknowledgment), it brings down the science to the day, and will go far to satisfy the growing desire for a knowledge of the foundations of the English language. Nor that alone—for to our mind its not least interesting passages are those which inquire into and describe the relations of English with kindred modern Teutonic dialects.

W. J. L.

Alone to the Alone: Prayers for Theists, by several Contributors. Edited, with a Preface, by Frances Power Cobbe. London: Williams and Norgate. 1871.

The prayers in this book are not offered "as models of what such compositions ought to be," but as shewing "what *are* the aspirations of living souls;" and on this account they cannot be read without a deep feeling of reverent respect, rendering literary criticism alike impertinent and vain.

Formally to write a prayer for a reader's edification would be the least religious of all tasks of authorship; the result might act as a fragment of dogmatic advice, valuable according to its kind; but it would never reach the depths of thought and love, or sustain penitence in its bitter conflict with despair.

The prayers in this volume are the actual aspirations of God-seeking souls which the reader is permitted to overhear, while they betray none of that fatal consciousness of a

listener's presence which takes away the charm and grace of so many professedly religious utterances. They are not laboured attempts to give moral precepts a greater sanctity by mechanically clothing them with the phraseology of devout address to the Deity, but genuine expressions of the faith of men communing with their Lord.

Miss Cobbe, in her Preface, which presents an admirable union of clear intellectual statement with devout reverence, describes the question of prayer as the hinge on which the whole character of our religion turns.

"If I were asked to describe what I considered the only important difference between the numberless minds whose mental latitude now lies between Atheism and authoritative Christianity, I should say that it was defined by the deep line between Theists who pray and Theists who do not pray. To the former, Theism is a Religion,—as I deem, the truest, purest, happiest, of all the religions of earth. To the latter, it is a Philosophy,—a refined, liberal and ennobling Philosophy, but not a Religion; and tending, I fear, to recede ever further from all that constitutes a Religion."*

This distinction is a line which divides members of all Christian sects and all religions, as well as the minds whose mental latitude lies between Atheism and authoritative Christianity. Miss Cobbe bears striking testimony to the fact, that wherever there is true prayer, there is an irresistible and triumphant oneness of soul. Minds trained in the schools of Christianity or of Heathenism, of the Roman Church or the Anglican, of the Calvinist or the Unitarian, the bonds of authority once broken and the soul set at liberty,† recognize the claims of one divine life and commune with One God. May not this be claimed as a glory of the spirit that "was in Jesus Christ," as well as a "note" of the "essential identity of Theism"?

To those, on the one hand, who dread lest by uttering a prayer they should outrage reason; and to those who, on the other hand, through fear lest they should never pray, surrender reason,—we equally commend Miss Cobbe's Preface.

The most determined believers in creeds founded upon authority will, we think, be compelled, as they read of

---

* Preface, pp. ix, x. † P. v.

those who "with a sum of countless prayers," have obtained intellectual freedom, to confess with Peter that God has put no difference "between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith;" while the stanchest opponents of outworn dogmas cannot dispute the fact, that a sense of personal relation to God does co-exist with rational faith in the hearts of those who have uttered the prayers this book contains.

To extemporize before an abstraction, consciously recognized as such (the argument in the Preface well contends), or to indulge in spiritual exercises as gymnastics for the benefit of the soul, is not to pray. Prayer is communion between man and his Maker; and belief in "God the Holy Ghost," is the very condition under which we attain faith in "God the Father Almighty." H. W. C.

Miscellaneous.

The Epistles of Paul have always had peculiar attractions for Protestant theologians, and that this interest continues is shewn by the constant appearance of fresh commentaries and translations. We demand from those who undertake such labours a candour that will investigate in an unprejudiced spirit what the apostle must be understood to mean, rather than seek to find in his words an authoritative confirmation of their own previously conceived opinions; and we also look for a comprehensiveness of view that will dwell on the general tenor of the writing, instead of pausing to lay stress on isolated texts. When these qualities are found in a writer on the Epistles, his contribution towards the right understanding of them must always be welcome, whatever the point of view from which he approaches the subject, and Mr. O'Connor's work* is on these grounds well worth the notice and study of the thoughtful reader. It is rather a paraphrase than a commentary, as it contains an analysis of the Epistle, dealing with its contents in large sections and conveying what the writer conceives to have been the apostle's general meaning, with few comments on particular verses. The subject is divided into

---

* A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. By the Rev. W. A. O'Connor, B.A. Longmans, Green and Co. 1871.

four chapters, headed "Justification, Life, Perfection, Election." The language is plain and vigorous, sometimes rising into eloquence. The thought is always clear, and in some cases possesses considerable originality. The book may be read with profit by any who seek to increase their intelligent appreciation of the noble Epistle which is its subject. Even those who may differ from some of the interpretations cannot but sympathize with the spirit of the author, and acknowledge the careful study and mental power that are manifested. As an instance, we quote a short passage from the conclusion of the section on "Life," which includes Romans iv. 25—viii. 18:

"The Son of God was sent that the contemplation of what He has done might arouse, invigorate and enlarge man's faculties, waken his moral powers, and establish the pre-eminence of the Spirit over the flesh. Christianity is not merely a mystery and a sacrament, it is moreover a willing development. It is not only a worship, but a service. Its power consists not in extinguishing the passions and affections of the flesh, but in elevating and enlarging the aspirations of the mind. It is an education, not a spell. It is no philosopher's stone, transmuting the baser metal into the more precious; it is an industry. It is health, not a specific. It is a divine civilization promoted by spiritual ascendancy."*

Mr. Godwin† has aimed at producing a translation that may be useful to those readers who cannot consult the original. He acknowledges in the Preface that alterations of the Received Version should not be made unnecessarily, but pleads for the advantage to be derived from "looking at the writings of prophets and apostles without the guise of an antique dress, and with the aids to clear thought and correct reasoning which are afforded by the language we daily use."‡ So much depends on individual taste as to the merits of a translation, that we would speak on this point with hesitation; but it does not appear that the version of the Galatians here offered is happy either in the avoidance of unnecessary change or in the choice of plain

---

* P. 59.

† The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians. A New Translation. With Critical Notes and Doctrinal Lessons. By John H. Godwin. Hodder and Stoughton. 1871.

‡ P. viii.

and simple language. Surely the well-known text, Gal. vi. 9, "Let us not be weary in well-doing," &c., is not improved by the change to, "In doing well, let us not be disheartened, for in the proper time we shall reap;" and "Faith which worketh by love" (Gal. v. 6), is more simple than "Faith which is effective through love." Many such cases might be instanced. A more serious fault is the translation of the contrast between the works of the flesh and the spirit, in chap. v., as though the former meant "the lower nature" of man, and the latter, the spirit of God. If for "flesh" we substitute "our lower nature," analogy would lead us to substitute for "spirit," "our higher nature." The copious notes contain some useful comments and explanations; but they are disfigured by summaries of the supposed lessons of each section, so printed as to suggest the idea of blank verse, and frequently expressing mere truisms, in the style of Tupper's Proverbial Philosophy:

> "Many prize what is worthless and oppose what is best.
> Our own wrong should be remembered in reproving others."*
>
> "The wisest and best may judge and act wrongly.
> Many are led astray by an improper sympathy."†

The author of "Bible Lore"‡ has condensed within the space of 300 pages a great deal of interesting information with respect to the Scriptures. Speaking of biblical archæology, Mr. Gray says that "the whole subject would require for its worthy treatment many goodly volumes, instead of a small fraction of one small book." This objection would apply still more to the present work as a whole; and yet the attempt to give a popular introduction to topics connected with the Bible has been well accomplished, at any rate from the author's point of view. What that is, may be inferred from his treatment of the question of Revision. "Against such an undertaking many powerful reasons may be adduced;" while the effect of such a work, if properly undertaken, would be not to "alter in any material degree the substantial teaching of the book," which, to quote the words of John Locke, "has God for its author, salvation

---

* P. 10. † P. 20.

‡ Bible Lore. By the Rev. J. Comper Gray. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1870.

for its end, and truth, without any admixture of error, for its matter."

On the other hand, in his "Plea for Revision,"* Mr. Abbott argues that we should not hesitate, if need be, to revise a translation which is itself the result of many revisions. He shews the need which exists for correcting the Authorized Version; and contends that the impossibility of producing a perfect work, once for all, ought not to prevent us from carrying out the work of improvement as far as that is now possible. The effect of letting the matter remain as it is, is thus forcibly delineated: "On nearly all these erroneous renderings sermons are preached, and commentaries written, as if they were infallible truth; false inferences are drawn, false doctrines supported, false morality enforced, or what is true is placed on a false basis, to the triumph of the unbeliever and the grief and discomfiture of the faithful."

In an exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, Mr. Boultbee, Principal of the London College of Divinity, endeavours to lay a solid foundation for the study of the theology of the Church of England.† He writes with candour and moderation, and evidently desires to free himself as much as possible from all party bias. The text of the Articles is exhibited in Latin and English side by side, and is then illustrated by reference to the original Articles of 1552 and comparison with the reformed Confessions; this is followed by "observations" and Scripture proofs. The writer has naturally availed himself largely of the labours of his predecessors, and the works of standard divines, such as Hooker, Barrow, Pearson, Waterland, Paley and others, are frequently laid under contribution. Mr. Boultbee has refrained from loading his pages with patristic citations, for which the student is generally referred to the exposition of Bishop Browne. From his own point of view, he is no doubt quite right; he does not desire to betray the uncertain orthodoxy of the early fathers. On the other hand,

---

* The English Bible and our Duty with regard to it: a Plea for Revision. By Thomas Kingsmill Abbott, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, and Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Dublin. Second Edition. London: Longmans. 1871.

† An Introduction to the Theology of the Church of England. By T. P. Boultbee, M.A. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1871.

the omission is perilous, because it looks like concealment of a damaging truth. Bearing in mind that the Articles were written by men who had been trained in the Roman system, our author has taken great pains to exhibit the Roman theology with accuracy and impartiality; and the quotations from the decrees of the Council of Trent, as well as from the writings of Aquinas, Bellarmine, &c., will be instructive to all students. In the same way, a series of passages from Calvin aptly represents the theological influences at work on the side of the reformers. Of course, criticism on special points would be here out of place. The caution of the writer is well illustrated in the comment on the clauses of the second Article relating to the doctrine of the Atonement, where he takes refuge in Pearson's explanation, that there are many instances in Scripture in which "to be reconciled to a person implies that person becoming favourable to the other." After carefully describing the variety of opinions on baptism, he observes that it is difficult to allege passages from divines of established reputation which may be accepted as typical representations of the doctrine of the Church of England on the subject of infant baptism, because an infant is outside our usual means of estimating spiritual results; and he evidently rejoices in the latitude allowed by the Gorham Judgment. Occasionally, however, the author's desire to harmonize conflicting views results in a sort of theological imbecility, as in his treatment of the descent of Jesus into hell, or in a complete confusion of moral ideas, as in the statement in the comment on the thirteenth Article, that "the best actions of the unregenerated have 'the nature of sin' likewise. Not that the action itself loses its right description as a virtue, but that in its origin and outcoming from the heart, in its relation to the spiritual nature of the doer of it, it could not fail to partake of the sinfulness which was in him."

Mr. Dale's discourses on "The Ten Commandments"* are intended to illustrate in a practical way the eternal principles of morality which constitute the basis of the Decalogue. With a forcible common sense and a clear and

* The Ten Commandments. By R. W. Dale, M.A. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1871.

vigorous style, the preacher has touched upon many questions affecting the moral life of individuals and nations, in a manner which cannot fail to command the interest of a larger circle than the congregation to which these sermons were originally addressed. A wide range of subjects is discussed with a freshness of illustration which secures attention, if not always sympathy. The institution of property, the right of making war, the relation of the sexes and the place and function of woman, commercial morality, the relation of art to religion,—on all these and many other topics, we have in this little volume the strong utterances of a robust mind. Mr. Dale recognizes the principle that the Bible is a literature and not a book; and points out that the commandments represent the claims of God, not on ourselves, but on a comparatively barbarous people. We wish he had carried out this idea a little further, and had plainly intimated that not only was the revelation itself rudimentary, but that the method in which it is stated to have been conveyed is equally so. Mr. Dale speaks as if he believed the narratives of the book of Exodus, for instance, straight through, without one word of qualification; he gives us no hint that the imaginative expressions of the ancient writers with respect to the divine action and speech are not to be interpreted as literally true; and we are surprised to find him assuming that Moses was the author of Deuteronomy. If Mr. Dale had incidentally discussed some of the historical questions to which he alludes, or of which he assumes the popular solution, with the same breadth of view and force of language with which he has dealt with many social difficulties, we should have liked his volume better.

In "The Schools for the People,"* Mr. Bartley aims at giving a complete history of Education in England during the last three hundred years, at least so far as concerns the industrial and poorer classes. A great deal of valuable information is thus brought together, which cannot fail to be of interest at the present moment. The rise and progress

---

* The Schools for the People, containing the History, Development and Present Working of each Description of English School for the Industrial and Poorer Classes. By George C. T. Bartley, Examiner Science and Art Department, Author of the One Square Mile in the East of London. London: Bell and Daldy. 1871.

of the various educational institutions for the poor are traced briefly, but clearly. No one can read this volume without feeling how inadequate the present arrangements are; but, on the other hand, the record of what has been *well* done in the past should fill us with hope with respect to the future. The numbers who grow up uneducated, the imperfect character of the education received, and the neglect of parents to provide for the education of their children where opportunity is afforded, are points which are well brought out in Mr. Bartley's book. The author introduces us to an old acquaintance of his, a sharp little fellow about twelve years of age, who did not know his own name, except that he was called "Diddlego," could of course not read, nor had he the slightest knowledge of the very elements of religion; and we are reminded that within a specified district of London there are at least twenty thousand such children. The following description of the quality of teaching in dame-schools is quoted from Dr. Hodgson: "None are too old, too poor, too ignorant, too feeble, too sickly, too unqualified in any or every way, to regard themselves and to be regarded by others as unfit for school-keeping." Such are some of the teachers in the heart of London, whose schools go to make up two-thirds of English schools. The worst feature of the case is, however, according to our author, the apathy and indifference of parents, which are so great, "that the provision already made in existing schools is not taken advantage of to nearly its full extent, in spite of the hundreds of thousands that are growing up in absolute ignorance." But while this work shews the difficulty of the problem which the nation has set itself to solve, it also affords much help and encouragement. "A greater part of the work," the author tells us, "was written before the Act of 1870 was framed. That measure has indeed rather stimulated me to hurry on its completion, as I ventured to hope that in issuing a succinct account of each description of school, I should save others many a weary search for information connected with educational matters." The variety of the schools now in existence, and the efficient means adopted to meet the case of those who have special difficulties to overcome, are points which are suggestive of encouragement. What a triumph it is to enable the blind to feel their way along the road of knowledge, to make cripples to work as efficiently as those

who are not afflicted, and, above all, to teach the dumb to speak! When patience, perseverance and intelligent care, can overcome difficulties like these, what may we not anticipate, under ordinary circumstances, from a fair amount of well-trained teaching power? Before we can hope, however, to solve the educational problem, we must have a universal system of compulsory attendance, the number and efficiency of teachers must be enormously increased, while the special wants of scholars must not be overlooked. Mr. Bartley shews the immense advantage which would accrue if the infant school could take the place of the dame-school; and institutions such as those which he describes for the special treatment of the blind, the cripple and the dumb, ought surely to be found, in the shape of rate-supported schools, in every town or district large enough to supply a sufficient number of pupils.

We are sure all those who saw Keshub Chunder Sen* during his recent visit to England will be much indebted to Miss Collet for collecting the principal addresses and sermons delivered by Mr. Sen during his sojourn among us, and also for putting on permanent record an account of the reception which he met with on every hand. This volume will tend to fix and deepen the transient impression of admiration felt by many a hearer. On the other hand, it will enable those who did not see this remarkable man, to form no inadequate conception of his character. These addresses and sermons breathe the spirit of a pure religion, of a noble patriotism, and of a perfectly unsectarian and world-wide philanthropy. He comes before us once more in this book to tell us of the wonderful religious reformation of which he is the representative; to urge the importance of those social reforms which he desires to see carried out in his native land; and, above all, by his personal influence to make England and India better acquainted with one another. From the vantage-ground of his intense and cultured piety, he can look with indifference upon the doubts which science casts upon the efficacy of prayer. "Let the *dreamy* (!) scientific man," he says, "try to point out to us that prayer is not necessary, or that it is unrea-

---

* Keshub Chunder Sen's English Visit. Edited by Sophia Dobson Collet. London: Strahan and Co. 1871.

sonable and foolish,—*experience* teaches us a different tale." He is clearly in sympathy with the essential spirit of Christianity, although declining to be called by the Christian name, or to accept all those dogmas with which it is generally associated. His two great and essential dogmas are Love to God and man. Those who peruse this book will sympathize with the speaker who thus described the effect of reading his lectures: "I felt myself brought into contact with a mind of a singularly devout, tender and spiritual tone, of a tone so distinctively and genuinely Christian as to put many of us to the blush for the base materialistic tone we so often take." One of the most remarkable features of Mr. Sen's "English Visit" was the union, the almost unprecedented union, which it wrought for a few brief moments among members of all religious sects. It was pleasing to find how denominational differences and sectarian jealousies could, for a time, be laid aside in the act of welcoming one who spoke from the heart the faith which was common to all. But it is something rather strange than pleasing to reflect that it was necessary for a Hindoo reformer to come all the way from India to England to teach its Christian inhabitants how to behave to one another. "English Christianity" he tells us (at the farewell soirée), "is too sectarian. . . . . God's church has been split up into a thousand little sectarian huts. Differences of opinion are inevitable; where honest differences do not exist, there must be stagnation and lifelessness; where there is life, there must be disunion, and against this I have nought to say; but what I protest against is the spirit of sectarian antipathy and antagonism which ill becomes a Christian. Christians of all denominations . . . are bound to stand together on the same platform." It is a lesson which we have yet to learn.

We are a little perplexed by Mr. Carroll's Dublin Sermons.* It is quite clear that he rejoices exceedingly in the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church, and that he wishes a like liberation from English dictation and "insolence" for the Irish State. In regard to the doctrine of Christ's Deity (which, with a common looseness of expression, he calls his "Divinity") and that of the

---

* Sermons preached in St. Bride's Church, Dublin. By W. G. Carroll, A.M. Dublin. 1871.

Eucharist, he tells his hearers very plainly and honestly that the greatest diversity of opinion has existed from the first, and that "if we had only the Old Testament and the four Gospels and Acts, ... there would be many more Unitarians than there are." He gives the Unitarian interpretation of many disputed passages, finding, however, the stronghold of the ordinary doctrine in the Epistles. He is very severe on the loose teaching of Bishop O'Brien; he speaks in terms of respect, if not of sympathy, of Bishop Colenso and Mr. Voysey. At the same time we should be entirely at a loss if asked to define his own theological position. Perhaps this was what Mr. Carroll intended, and his lectures were chiefly designed to shew his hearers that there are two sides even to questions which the Church has most dogmatically decided. This in itself is a praiseworthy, though too rare, undertaking; and we shall expect still more and better from a man who has shewn so much willingness to examine, and ability to appreciate, religious opinions which are not his own.

We have deliberately postponed all comment upon the Purchas case, and its effect upon Church politics, until judgment is pronounced in the pending and more important case of the vicar of Frome. In the mean time, however, we may acknowledge the receipt of a temperate Letter* from Sir J. T. Coleridge—the father of the Solicitor-General and the biographer of Keble—to Canon Liddon, deprecating the rebellion against the Judicial Committee which the latter seemed to advocate; and of a voluminous pamphlet by Mr. Orby Shipley,† counselling immediate and concerted resistance. What the issue will be, a few months or perhaps weeks will reveal. A decision against the doctrine of the Real Presence will reduce all ritual controversies to insignificance; while one in its favour will effectually help triumphant Anglicans to put up with the deprivation of vestments and incense.

"Apostolical Succession not a Doctrine of the Church of

---

* Remarks on some Parts of the Report of the Judicial Committee in the Case of Elphinstone *v.* Purchas, &c. A Letter to the Rev. Canon Liddon, M.A., D.C.L. By the Right Hon. Sir J. T. Coleridge. London: Murray. 1871.

† Secular Judgments in Spiritual Matters, considered in relation to some recent Events. By the Rev. Orby Shipley, M.A. London: Masters. 1871.

England,"* is an historical essay addressed by a Catholic to an Anglican friend. The line of argument taken is, that the English Church, especially during the century which succeeded the Reformation, has been accustomed to testify its own disbelief in the sacrament of order, as an episcopal prerogative transmitted by apostolical succession, by the recognition of Presbyterian and other foreign Protestant ministers, who, as is well known, were admitted to benefices and dignities in England without re-ordination. The reasoning as against the high Anglican of the present day seems conclusive enough, but then this is not the only side on which the Anglican position is open to Catholic assault. To a disbeliever in the "sacrament of order," the argument has no application.

We have no doubt that Mr. Jones' address† as Chairman of the Congregational Union was impressive and effective, but it is hardly one of the speeches that bear printing. The reader has only to ask himself in plain terms the meaning of each successive paragraph, to discover that he is dealing with respectable commonplaces which touch the heart of no difficulty. At the same time, we cheerfully admit that the address contains a pleasing variety of illustration, and is characterized by a genuine earnestness.

E.

---

* Apostolical Succession not a Doctrine of the Church of England: an Historical Essay, &c. By Cantab. Longmans. 1870.

† The Work of the Christian Preacher. By the Rev. Thomas Jones. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1871.

THE

THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

No. XXXV.—October, 1871.

I.—PAUPERISM, ITS CAUSES AND REMEDIES.

Pauperism, its Causes and Remedies. By Henry Fawcett, M.A., M.P., Professor of Political Economy in the University of Cambridge. London: Macmillan and Co.

The somewhat ambitious title which we have affixed to the present article has been taken from a recent volume by Mr. Fawcett, the Professor of Political Economy of Cambridge, a title, however, which the character of the work in our opinion hardly justifies. Nevertheless, its very comprehensiveness will perhaps afford us a reasonable opportunity of discussing many matters which the stricter limits of the book itself under a mere analytical treatment of its contents might otherwise have excluded. The subject, vast as it is, with its innumerable and almost inextricable collateral branches, is perhaps better taken in its entirety than broken up into some sectional division and treated piecemeal, after the too common fashion of modern philanthropy. Those only who have passed through the painful processes of long and frequent sittings on Committees, when some one of the parts of this great whole may have been under investigation, can adequately appreciate the relief which we ourselves feel when brought face to face with certain large principles, instead of wandering here and there through the crotchetty mazes of some social specialist, who is prepared at a moment's notice to cure the curse of centuries by the mere adoption of a single resolution, or the appointment of one more Committee.

Professor Fawcett's work can at any rate lay claim to be characterized by a simplicity of aim and directness of recom-

mendation which cannot be ascribed to some more ambitious volumes on the same theme. The Professor has few doubts about the real tap-root of the evil, and is not, therefore, like so many of his compeers, continually fumbling among the tangled growth of subordinate abuses in search of a point at which to apply his own peculiar treatment. Popular ignorance, in a great measure maintained and supported by a system of half-hearted legislation, taking the form of permissive clauses and other recent absurdities,—this, in the opinion of the Professor, and we may add, with some little experience in these matters, in our own also, is the true root of our national pauperism.

We are well aware that in endorsing this opinion of Mr. Fawcett we are to some extent running counter to the recent propositions of Mr. Froude laid down in his melancholy vaticinations on the backslidings of England. We may also incur some risk of a contemptuous contradiction from such bodies as the Education Union, which, in company with the National Society, seems prepared to prove that the inner education of the masses is not so bad as it seems. Nevertheless, we have little hesitation in saying, with a keen recollection of certain figures supplied from the great industrial centres of the Midlands by Her Majesty's Assistant Commissioners, that the present condition of great masses of the people in London, Liverpool, Birmingham and other great towns, is not very far advanced beyond that of the ancient city wherein six-score thousand persons could not discern between their right hand and their left. The statistics of Mr. J. G. Fitch, and more especially those collected by him at Birmingham, have never been answered. And in supporting Mr. Fawcett in his main proposition of the necessity of wider national education, we cannot disguise our wonder that he has not yet recognized the further fact, that nothing short of a thorough system of free schools will ever meet the terrible necessities of the city poor. As far as he goes, however, Mr. Fawcett is very distinct in his utterances on the educational question in its relations to pauperism.

On the more direct remedies for the evils which are embodied in this social disease, the Professor has much to say which we shall presently treat somewhat in detail; but the seven chapters entitled respectively, (1) Pauperism and the Old Poor Law, (2) Pauperism and the Present

Poor-law System, (3) On the Increase of Population, (4) National Education, its Economic and Social Effects, (5) Co-partnership and Co-operation, (6) The English System of Land Tenure, (7) The Enclosure of Commons,—can hardly be considered to afford an exhaustive analysis of the question in hand. Historically, pauperism is somewhat difficult to disentangle from the ruins of feudalism on the one side, in which the American mind, to judge from a recent article in the North American Review, seems to have discovered its origin, or from the fierce crush of competitive commerce, which the modern co-operator tells us we must now charge with the many social evils in which we are involved. That the old established mendicity which followed the ecclesiastical system, was first broken up into a floating mass of disorganized poor, on the disestablishment of the monasteries, there can be but little doubt; and in the celebrated Law of Elizabeth, generally looked upon as the key-stone of our Poor-law system, we trace the first serious effort to strangle this growing evil. Under that law, and for nearly 150 years after its enactment, as far as history informs us, good results followed, and it was apparently not till the time of the Georges that the old curse began once more to make itself severely felt in the heavy taxation of the people and the rapidly diminishing prosperity of the country. From 1767 to 1832, the flood-gates seemed to have been opened wider and wider for the incursions of pauperism, till at the time that the Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into and report on the whole subject, the very country itself, to adopt Mr. Fawcett's language, "shewed symptoms of national bankruptcy and permanent ruin." All this and more, the Professor mainly attributes to the relaxations of the stringent rules of the law of Elizabeth with respect to the able-bodied poor not being assisted without being "set on work." Accordingly, in face of this overwhelming crisis, the Poor-law Amendment Act of 1834 became law, and so in a certain sense the land had peace for the best part of forty years. The provisions of this law can, however, never be said to have been thoroughly carried out.

Now, again, the same terrible story threatens to repeat itself, and year after year the figures on the out-door relief list have been mounting up, till, in the year of grace 1870,

no less a number than 977,700 persons were in the course of the year on the books of the guardians, amounting to nearly 1 in every 20 of the entire population of England. In Scotland, it would appear that 1 in every 23 has at some time in the year found a way to the parish loaf; whilst, in honourable distinction to the sister countries, Ireland has but one pauper returned for every 74 of her population. The explanation of these facts, Professor Fawcett finds in the growing relaxation of the workhouse test in one country, and its rigid enforcement in the other. Be the causes what they may, the fact of very extensive pauperism remains, and it is that to which we must now direct our attention.

And here we may for a moment step aside and consider how far pauperism must necessarily be counted as a constituent element in any advanced society such as that of the nineteenth century. Theologians and that large class of verbal interpreters who still insist upon applying the laws of Moses to matters which more immediately belong to the school of philosophers represented by Mr. Mill, are never tired of telling us that "the poor shall never cease out of the land," though hitherto we confess they have failed to shew us that paupers and poor are necessarily synonymous terms. But admitting this assertion of the theologians to be wanting in conclusiveness, we are nevertheless driven to acknowledge that the course of social progress does not yet afford us much hope that the stratum of lower and broken life which passes technically under the name of pauperism has been sensibly diminished as time goes on. On the contrary, the necessity for some system of State recognition and treatment of the evil as one of the permanent diseases of humanity, seems to press itself more and more on the minds of statesmen; and for a careful exposition of the extent to which even the youngest and most flourishing countries are liable to the same curse, we cannot do better than refer a reader desirous of following out this branch of our subject, to an article on "American and Colonial Pauperism" in the Westminster Review for July, 1870. In that article the author shews how each one of our colonies has been gradually driven to adopt measures for the systematic support of large numbers of its poor, and also that the United States are yearly approaching nearer and nearer to the principles of the Poor-law

Amendment Act of 1834 in their own administration of relief. It will no doubt be said, and with some reason, that much of the pauperism both of America and our colonies is not native, and that so long as home economists think fit to export, in the name of charity, persons who are useless to the community they leave, it is hardly fair to charge those countries that receive them with the pauper population they are called upon to maintain. Nevertheless, with all reasonable deductions made on the grounds we have just indicated, there will still, we fear, be found a considerable residuum of weak and purposeless human material which has to be provided for by some means outside of the individuals who compose it. And this, after all, is but another way of expressing a belief that for some time to come we must look upon pauperism as one of the growths which are not to be lightly disregarded or too hastily treated in making provision for the general well-being of the body politic. Admitting, therefore, that the disease is a serious one and likely to last for a long time to come, if not to be hurriedly pronounced chronic, we may now consider to what extent Professor Fawcett, or any other of the more enlightened social physicians who have given their special attention to it, have as yet suggested the remedies. Education, in its widest sense, and involving the highest and most universal culture that future organization can develop, we may all admit to be an essential condition of any final and successful experiment. Meanwhile the symptoms are severe and delay is dangerous. It is therefore imperative upon us to see how far under existing conditions some mitigation of the evil, if extinction for the present be impossible, may at once be brought about.

And here, on the threshold of the inquiry, Mr. Fawcett has a grave charge to prefer against the law as it is at present administered; and in his second essay (for the volume that we are reviewing consists more distinctly of a series of essays than of consecutive chapters) he shews with severe simplicity how the most grievous improvidence, neglect of children, and at the same time reckless increase of population, are encouraged under our present method. On the first point, the rapidly growing number of enrolled paupers side by side with commercial statistics over which the heart of a Rothschild or an Overstone rejoices, should be sufficient evidence;

though to what precise extent the distant prospect of a workhouse, or even the parish loaf outside of it, may contribute to the squandering of money or health in early youth amongst our labouring classes, it is very difficult indeed to determine. Things must, however, have advanced very far in the direction of the demoralization that we now allude to, when a large body of Somersetshire colliers should think it a mere matter of natural business to stipulate on joining a benefit club, that the fact of their receiving relief from the society should not disqualify them from relief from the rates. And the case of the Somersetshire colliers is not without abundance of parallels in London and elsewhere. Nor is this want of providence confined to a mere distant outlook, but day by day, as we have reason to know from a long and melancholy experience of such cases, the independent energies and natural self-reliance of the workman are sapped and destroyed by too easy contact with the machinery of relief. It is now no uncommon thing for a workman, with one hand on the parish loaf and another on the miserable dole of the benevolent, to refuse the wages of industry altogether, because, forsooth, the wages which he is to receive in the place that is open to him are not perhaps quite so high as those current in the place he lives in, but in which he finds it impossible to be employed at all. How the mass of the working classes, and more especially the representatives of the skilled trades whose organizations are really so worthy of our praise, can, as is too frequently the case, support this subtle form of self-delusion and dependence generated of pauperism, it is hard to say; yet such support is by no means rare under existing circumstances; and thus the supposed extra wage of Newcastle, kept up by the exclusion of foreign labour, is secured by the payment of a crushing rate in London,—this rate falling most heavily on the artizan and shopkeeper, whose economical outlook does not carry him beyond his own apparent earnings or loss in a matter which in reality concerns the welfare of the whole community of which he is a member.

Respecting the general improvidence of the poor, so keenly urged by Mr. Fawcett, it must, however, be remembered on the other side, that the deposits in Savings' Banks, especially those at the Post-offices, have continued to increase from year to year, amounting, by recent returns, to more than

a million in the year; and in Ireland (most significant fact of all, for there out-relief is so exceptional as to be almost nil) similar institutions are now very largely made use of even by the poorest. Nevertheless, in that great mass of helpless, incompetent folk who are always trembling on the confines of pauperism, there is little doubt that a spirit of reasonable prudence might emancipate them from more than half the evils under which they at present groan. It is within our own knowledge that large numbers of skilled labourers, earning in many cases wages (one had almost written salaries) more than equal to the stipends of many a clerk or curate, are, under stress of a few days' slack trade, as prompt and unabashed applicants at the relief office as if they had been starving on the miserable pittance of some Dorsetshire hind all the rest of the year. The influence of trades' unionism in retarding the circulation of labour except under such conditions as are agreeable to the leaders of the trade, must not be forgotten in this connection; but we believe that the great organizations of labour should be credited with so much good in the highest development of the people, that we are not desirous of pressing this point further than the strictest evidence may demand. Apart entirely from the operations of the trade societies, which, after all, as yet sway only a comparatively small portion of the working classes, we repeat that the present administration of the Poor-law, especially in London, has a most disastrous tendency to foster the stagnation of labour. And it was with this consciousness, no doubt, that the late Edward Denison, one of the most promising of all our Poor-law reformers, wrote in one of his letters (recently privately printed by Sir Baldwyn Leighton), that "the establishment of a free exchange of labour between all parts of Great Britain,—the universal, timely and minute intelligence with regard to the circumstances of every trade,—the contrivance of organizations whereby the labourers might adapt themselves to those circumstances,—the prosecution of these and kindred objects might well be the care of those who would merit the glorious title of Guardians of the Poor." Under existing circumstances, nothing of the sort indicated by Mr. Denison is even so much as attempted by our local boards; and, in illustration of our statement, only a short time since a communication reached us from three youths, of the ages of

19, 18 and 17 respectively (all of whom had been in industrial schools), dated from one of the metropolitan unions, stating that they were all able-bodied and willing to work, but did not *know* how far certain reports with regard to labour away from London might be false or true, and therefore they remained within the walls of the workhouse, where it is quite possible they may still remain, though Lancashire and other districts of England, we believe, would at the present time be glad of their services, and be willing at once to pay them at least self-supporting wages. Want of organization with respect to knowledge that should be made accessible to all those who are temporarily under the shelter of the Poor-law, has, in our opinion, much to do with the failure that has attended the efforts of guardians to meet the inroads of pauperism; and it is not surprising to find Mr. Fawcett charging the Poor-law system itself with much of the improvidence that is so rife among us. If it be widely known that in the event of any temporary depression of trade, or other circumstances incidental to any calling, it is not improbable that a visit to the relief office will be attended with some sort of assistance (for the workhouse, we fear, is not very often offered to the large family whose acceptance of it would for the moment be more expensive than stone-yard relief and allowance to the children), it is not very likely that much provision will be made for the rainy day or the inevitable hour of sickness. In support of this view, Professor Fawcett has shewn how prejudicially the recent relaxation of the workhouse test has operated even in Scotland, a country proverbially, and we believe rightly, credited with native forethought and thrift. The same result from the same causes has been pointed out by Mr. E. W. Hollond in a careful analysis of the increase of pauperism in Eastern London during the last ten years, under the out-door system, amounting in Bethnal Green to over 400 per cent.; and we may therefore reasonably conclude, with Mr. Fawcett, that some immediate curtailment of out-door relief is essential to secure the diminution of pauperism. How far the operations of the Act introduced by Mr. Goschen to place the charges of the in-door poor on the common fund, leaving the out-door to be paid by a local charge, will exercise the indirect tendency to limit the out-door system, as it was doubtless intended to do, yet remains to be seen. Mean-

while the evil is no slight one, and we cannot afford to trifle with it.

On the question of child-desertion and the weakening of parental responsibility under the existing methods of administration, which is the second head of the indictment preferred by Mr. Fawcett, much might be written; and the mere fact that a special organ, known as the "Poor-law Unions Gazette," concerns itself entirely with a description of persons who desert their families, will sufficiently indicate that the offence, whether directly resultant from the vices of the Poor-law system itself or not, is by no means an uncommon one. Under any circumstances, a lax and easy method of out-door assistance, taking the form sometimes, within our own knowledge, of relief from two adjoining unions at the same time, cannot but lead more or less to the consequences in the way of desertion which Professor Fawcett complains of.

Nevertheless, the third and last count in the Professor's general indictment is certainly the gravest, though in many ways the most difficult to treat. An encouragement to reckless increase of population, says Mr. Fawcett, is the most lamentable of all the consequences which now attend the mal-administration of the law. Notwithstanding the growth of free-trade, which in the opinion of its early advocates was "to scatter plenty o'er a smiling land," and notwithstanding also the increased facilities for cheap and easy locomotion brought about by the growth of our railway system, London has still her black roll of more than 120,000 paupers, and the agricultural districts seem to swarm with half-starved and hopeless labourers at wages varying, as a recent Parliamentary return shews us, from 8*s.* to 18*s.* a week. Long ago, Mr. Malthus recorded his opinion, that "nothing can permanently improve the condition of the poor but increased prudence in marriage. Unless you have this, improvements in other respects are of very little consequence. Under the best government imaginable, there may be thousands upon thousands starved." Yet at the present time we are all familiar with the special appeals that are made in all classes of destitution, from the clergy downwards, on the face of which, "seven little children, all under nine"—"a very large family totally unprovided for," are the most prominent features; and in another

direction we have zealous ministers of the same Church to which Mr. Malthus belonged, though of a very different social creed, sending forth their Emigration pamphlets by the tens of thousands, at the head of which runs the strange advising text, "Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth." And perhaps, of all offenders against the true gospel of Malthus (for we dismiss in silence the lower interpretation of his writings sufficiently exploded by Professor F. W. Newman in a recent number of Fraser's Magazine), are the State emigrationists, under whose auspices at certain seasons, conditioned far more on the readiness of the English public to give than that of the colonial public to receive, all the so-called surplus labour would be shipped off from the garrets of Eastern London to the backwoods of Canada or the valleys of Virginia. These social physicians are never tired of telling us that the old country is suffering from plethora, and that only a wholesale deportation of the people will relieve the congestion. And yet side by side with the proposed exodus, to be conducted over the Atlantic by the raising of a new rate, apparently as easy a process to some reformers as the raising of Moses' hands in the old narrative, we are told on very good authority that the mills of Lancashire are silent for want of hands to work the loom, and the ship-yards of the far North still waiting their complement of able and willing men. Altogether, between the doctors who say there is no room and the doctors who say that there are no men, it is a somewhat difficult matter to shape an accurate judgment. In our own opinion, the truth, as in most cases, lies between the two statements; but that the multiplication of children continues, independently of the assured means of providing for them, is equally true. And for this state of things, the Poor-law administration, with its careless doles, there can be small doubt, is extensively, if indirectly, responsible.

Again, in addition to the listlessness in seeking new fields of labour, particularly characteristic of London, where probably on the whole the Poor-law is worst administered, by reason of central aggregation without proper central and local organization, a terrible disregard of all the elements of sanitary law may be found embodied in the returns of infant mortality in the poorer quarters. The massacres of the innocents of which we now speak most assuredly

"out-Herod Herod;" and the evidence of all the most experienced officers of health in our town districts tends to shew that the greater part of this mortality might be avoided if only sanitary conditions could be improved, and parents awakened to the commonest sense of cleanliness and decency. As matters now are, whole courts and alleys, seething with a mass of humanity which no organization has as yet reduced to discipline or order, are from time to time decimated with fever, small-pox or other plagues, which select the ill-fed, uncleanly poor for their prey; whilst with local self-government priding itself on its superiority over all other forms of government, such measures as Mr. Torrens' most useful, though, we admit, cumbrous, "Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings' Act, 1868," remain a dead letter even in the very districts in which the local authorities have made the primary orders for their being carried out. With such ghastly phenomena as are day by day forcing themselves on our attention in all our large cities, it is therefore melancholy to see such brilliant writers as Mr. Ruskin and Mr. Froude wasting their time in bewailing the past, or devising new Arcadias for agricultural labourers bedecked with holiday ribbons, and singing songs of triumph over the abolition of railways and the prohibition of machinery; or, as in the case of the latter of the two, advocating a wholesale system of emigration for persons who will be as much paupers in Toronto or Melbourne as they are now in Whitechapel or Bethnal Green.

A strong and a firm hand thrust into the miserable meshwork of local wretchedness and Bumbledom, and a closer adjustment of the higher humanities which should be established between rich and poor in all the great centres of industrial life, are primarily essential to any thorough grasp of this question of Pauperism, so far at least as it is represented by our larger towns. But before much can be done in the direction which we have just indicated, the complete saturation of the public mind with larger principles of economic law and a sense of the baneful influences of indiscriminate almsgiving, is all-essential. The cruel charity which by idle gift or dole has for centuries past done so much to destroy the best fibres of English industry, must be superseded by the higher spirit of self-sacrifice which shall hereafter offer the better gifts of time and trouble in

place of mere shillings and groceries, before any real reform in the conditions of the poor out of which pauperism takes its spring, has been effected. Some signs of this better day have during the last few years made their appearance in London, and other great towns following in the wake of the metropolis, by the institution of Charity Organization Societies, through which a serious attempt is at last being made to consolidate public opinion and action on a subject which has too long been relegated to Exeter Hall annual meetings or District Visiting Societies' tea-tables. The movement for the Organization of Charity has moreover not been confined to our own country, but has shewn itself in almost precisely similar manifestations in the great cities of America and elsewhere, so that at the present time the State of Massachusetts is among the few districts in the world in which it can be shewn that pauperism is made amenable to treatment under a comprehensive plan of co-operation amongst all engaged in the administration of aid. The statistics of that portion of the United States shew a clear reduction in the number of dependent persons, with no very special causes, apart from an improved system of management, to account for the change. In England, we fear, progress has not gone very far; but the exertions of Mr. Hicks, Dr. Hawksley, Sir C. Trevelyan and others, who have persistently written and spoken on the subject for some years past, are at last beginning to bear fruit. On all sides, conferences are being held, organizations formed, and action taken, on a subject which only a few years since, we can well remember, would hardly attract a handful of men to hear the matter discussed in the most general way. It is now evident that before long some great change in the administration of the Poor-law must take place. Mr. Goschen's celebrated, but, in our opinion, somewhat overrated minute of November 20, 1869, having recognized that private charity, as a power for evil or good in dealing with the dependent classes, could no longer be ignored by the representatives of Gwydyr House or the local administrators of the law, has been followed by the Act before referred to, under which the expenses of in-door relief are made a charge upon the common fund, and the entire burden of out-door relief left to fall, as it should, on the local ratepayers. Added to these instalments of reform, we have now the

"Pauper Inmates' Discharge and Regulation Act," by which the principle of detention, under certain conditions which will, to some extent, prevent the wholesale abuse of public accommodation for a most worthless class of vagabonds, has been endorsed by the legislature. Much, nevertheless, remains to be done, apart from all Charity Organization Societies, partial Poor-law reforms, or the mere energies of a few far-sighted individuals, before any palpable impression is made on the solid mass of pauperism which has been banking up under a system of central diffidence and local mismanagement for more than a quarter of a century past. Those who think we have written too strongly in this last sentence should be constrained, as we have been, to read the massive Reports of the Poor-law Board, on one side, and the daily recorded squabbles of certain Boards of Guardians on the other. On the one hand, a mountain of idle returns and empty figures, thrown together with little or no attempt to educe any higher law or more wholesome application; on the other, in most of our towns, with some few exceptions, little knots of busybodies playing with a tremendous social and economic problem as though it required no deeper thought or higher vision than are involved in ordering supplies or signing cheques. In one direction, reckless waste, showering food and clothing on a lazy horde of out-door recipients who hardly take the trouble to walk to the workhouse to receive them; in another, a niggardly meanness which orders coffins by contract, with no regard to the proportions of the wretched corpses that have to be crushed into them. In one union, paying a medical officer, with multitudinous duties of the most delicate description, the wages of a waiter; in another, remunerating a collector with the pay of a colonel. All these and many more abuses, perhaps even more representative than those we have just touched on, will have to be removed before any true Poor-law reformer will obtain the necessary out-look to enable him to effect any marked reduction in the ranks of pauperism. Perhaps a recent amalgamation of the Metropolitan Relieving Officers' Association and Workhouse Masters' Association may go some way to further consolidate the public opinion of the officials themselves in the direction of reform; but the fact of the new Association, under the name of "The Metropolitan and

Provincial Poor-law Officers' Association," having, as we think, in a spirit of narrow exclusiveness, declined to receive into its ranks the workhouse and district schoolmasters, in addition to those officers who formed the bases of the two old Associations, makes us fear that we may still have to wait some time before those larger educational processes which we indicated at the outset of this paper as amongst the real remedies, or, more truly speaking, preventives, of pauperism, are recognized as such by those who should be most instrumental in seeing them applied.

We may here glance for a moment at Professor Fawcett's views on the boarding-out of pauper children, involving as they do many of the issues which spring from the more general educational side of the question. The Professor, it would seem, is decidedly opposed to the boarding-out system, which he considers likely to be directly conducive to wholesale desertion of children, and in an aggravated degree to all the other evils which, in his opinion, flow from the Poor-law as now administered. In support of this view he remarks, that "the system is an importation from Scotland, where it has been in operation for many years," and where, he adds, "it is notorious that, in spite of the religious zeal of the Scotch, there is far more illegitimacy in that country than in any other part of the United Kingdom." The Professor seems to us to forget that statistics of illegitimacy in Scotland are not, in one sense, so conclusive of social demoralization as in England, the laws of legitimation on subsequent marriage having, we suspect, far more to do with the larger ratio of illegitimacy to the population, than has the system of boarding-out of the pauper children: the bothie system may also, apart from the Poor-law, be credited with some of the present unfortunate phenomena. It is, we know, difficult enough at all times to trace the indirect inducements to vice or crime afforded by an imperfect law, as also it is to trace the full preventive force of a stringent one; but to attribute the current illegitimacy of Scotland to a system which, so far as investigation by the Assistant Commissioner appointed by the Poor-law Board proceeded, has at any rate been credited with many excellent results, would certainly, in our opinion, require far stronger evidence than the mere assertion of Mr. Fawcett. But under this system in England, we are told, so attrac-

tive are the advantages which it offers to persons overburdened with children and scant of cash, "that it will henceforward be almost the duty of persons who are so circumstanced to desert their children, because by so doing the welfare of these children will be greatly promoted." In making this very strong augury of the results of the boarding-out system, Mr. Fawcett seems to have forgotten, or may be is not cognizant of the fact, that the measures taken for the prosecution of persons deserting their children are amongst the most common of those which are put in force with the necessary degree of promptitude by the local authorities; and with the aid of the "Poor-law Unions Gazette," it is not now so very difficult to bring the philosophic deserter of a too numerous family, as depicted by Mr. Fawcett, to some sense of his shortcomings. We do not ourselves write with any great enthusiasm in favour of the boarding-out system, being fully cognizant of its possible abuses; but, despite the rose-coloured pictures of district schools given us by Mr. Tufnell in his Reports to the Poor-law Board, we have good reason to know that in too many cases the wholesale methods of district-school machinery have not been really successful in fitting the children that came under their operations for either household or industrial life.

But we must pass on from the particular objections urged by Mr. Fawcett to the present arrangements of the Poor-law, and consider, though somewhat more briefly than their character deserves, the recommendations that he offers for remedies in the future. Foremost of these, as we have stated at the commencement of this article, Mr. Fawcett places a thorough system of National Education, and his fourth chapter is devoted to this branch in its Economic and Social relations. It may be imagined that, with strong views on the primary necessity of education of a high order, Mr. Fawcett has little sympathy with the so-called "permissive compulsion" of the "Elementary Education Act, 1870." "It seems probable" to him "that not more than three or four large towns will avail themselves of the power conferred on them, and that not a single country parish will take advantage of it." We trust that so gloomy and doubtful a forecast as is indicated in this opinion may not be verified; but if we are to judge from the comparatively

slow pace at which many of the School Boards are travelling, it will be long before they have arrived at a clear and comprehensive enforcement of that compulsion without which we are certain they will make no impression on the dense ignorance of our city children. With compulsion must, in our opinion, as we hinted elsewhere, be established a system of national free schools; and it is a source of regret to find that at a recent meeting of the Ragged School Union of London, the Earl of Shaftesbury contended earnestly for the future maintenance of an extensive and comparatively ineffectual net-work of voluntary ragged schools outside of the School Board operations. The continuance of the old ragged schools, good as in some respects many of them may have been, seems to us most unjustifiable, and in the larger and truer interests of the poor themselves we hope public opinion will so far endorse the view that we express, as to compel the School Boards in our great towns to take the whole poorer population, even to the very lowest, under their supervision and charge. As things now are, even in districts where ragged schools most abound, the streets seethe with little urchins who, save for a certain activity of animal life which open-air exercise all day long seems to develop, are in as pitiable a condition as can be imagined. If left to themselves, these children of the streets cannot fail to be candidates for the workhouse and gaols in the future; and still the School Boards go on with their wranglings on the denominational and other difficulties, though, as Mrs. Garrett-Anderson very pertinently remarked, the only "article" to which the parents or children object, if put to the test, is that of education itself. It would be useless to point out the general consequences of our present popular ignorance. As of old, "the people is consumed for lack of knowledge" in more ways than one; but certain special calamities, peculiarly baneful to us at the present time, may be here glanced at.

With wider knowledge, as Professor Fawcett also suggests, a spontaneous and judicious emigration, side by side with home migration, would spring up. Against a wholesale system of State emigration, such as is, strangely enough, advocated by the author of "Ginx's Baby," he is naturally very emphatic; but at present the comparative advantages of Canada or the United States are not brought within the

curriculum of the national school in most country districts. Within the last two years we are glad to see that the Emigration Commissioners have vouchsafed a popular "Information for Emigrants," in place of the old "Colonization Circular," printed in the minutest of types, quite unreadable by workmen, and sold at a heavy loss. The indirect results of education in the gradual repression of intemperance, it is hardly necessary to enlarge on; and for ourselves we are disposed to agree with Professor Fawcett, notwithstanding the now somewhat clamorous agitation of the Permissive-Bill party, "that there is only one way to cure intemperance, and that is to diffuse amongst the people a taste for rational and intellectual pleasures."

If, however, a comprehensive system of education is to have its full effect in the reduction of pauperism, it will chiefly be, in Mr. Fawcett's opinion, through the adoption of the co-operative and other progressive ideas of society which it will have enabled the people to attain. Under existing circumstances, even industrial co-partnership, from which so much may reasonably be expected, has been tried only in a few branches of labour in which very much depends on the individual will and care of the workmen. As yet, no experiment has been made in the great masses of men engaged mainly in a mechanical carrying out of the employer's orders. The experience of Briggs and Co.'s colliery, Fox, Head and Co., and a few other firms, encouraging as they are, are yet not sufficient to make us trust in the development of the industrial-partnership idea as a rapid remedy for the evils of pauperism. The fierce warfare which is now waged between employers and employed, and the sudden and capricious strikes which so often paralyze whole branches of industry for long periods of time, do not as yet augur very well for the nearness of that promised land, in which the interests of master and man shall be recognized as one, and towards which the more devoted of the co-operators have pointed us. Nevertheless, even in these conflicts, gleams of a better life are making themselves apparent; and the institution in some parts of England of Courts of Conciliation and Arbitration, with the admirable results that they have secured, makes it probable that many of the more deplorable aspects of trades' unionism at the present time may be altered in the future. A recognition of common interests

permeating many parallel or but slightly associated trades, may be observed also in the recent institution of Trades' Halls, mainly, we believe, promoted in this country by Mr. James Samuelson, of Liverpool, at which the various societies have found a business centre, whilst at the same time they have emancipated themselves from the trammels of the public-house. Yet, with all these admissions of progress, we are very far from eradicating pauperism. Indeed, the roots have, we fear, struck too deep to be removed by any sudden process. And if any perceptible change has been effected in the social condition of the artizan through better organization within his own class, the miserable plight of the agricultural labourer is still a scandal in our midst. A small experiment in the way of agricultural co-operation at Assington, in Suffolk, and another short-lived endeavour in the same direction made by Mr. Vandeleur at Ralahine, and recently recorded by Mr. W. Pare in his "Co-operative Agriculture," are duly set forth by Mr. Fawcett; but they are as yet so infinitesimal a leaven in the great lump of rural poverty and dependence, that we must not expect any large results of the same character for a long time to come. Meanwhile, School Boards will certainly do something to quicken the intellectual conditions upon which ultimate regeneration must rest. No comprehensive plan for lightening the weight of work among the masses, no scheme for the more even distribution of labour, or indeed for any other of the larger objects involved in the radical treatment of pauperism, can as yet secure the attention they demand, for the simple reason, that the great body of the people is not capable of understanding them when they are offered to them even under the most favourable aspects.

The slowness with which the "Museum and Public Libraries Act" has been taken advantage of even in many of the great industrial centres of England, sufficiently indicates how apathetic as yet are the constituencies of ratepayers with whom the responsibility lies. Such ideas as Mr. Fawcett would have the people to embrace, though elementary enough to men of large outlook and early culture, are not easily adopted by the multitude, whose chief concern is to find the daily means to meet the daily wants. At a time when at large meetings of working men it is not uncommon to hear resolutions in support of a return to Protec-

tion openly discussed and often nearly carried, it is not very probable that the severe gospel of political economy will find large numbers suddenly converted to its message. The doctrines of the International Association, with all its extravagances, to some extent indicate the creed of the most advanced thinkers of the working classes; but the extent to which they have as yet been intelligently embraced by the persons they more immediately concern, is by no means proportionate to the comprehensive character of their platform. Amongst the natural articles of faith of the International Association—and indeed, we may add, of all the working-class radical organizations—is the necessity for an early alteration of the land-tenure system in England, and to this question Mr. Fawcett has also devoted one chapter of his work. Whether, however, this question has so direct or extensive a bearing upon the removal of pauperism as the Professor assumes, we confess to have some misgivings; and perhaps in this subdivision, as palpably as in some others of his treatment, too little stress may have been laid upon the moral aspects of pauperism, as opposed to the more distinctly material. That the abolition of the law of entail and the existing rights of primogeniture would do much to increase the agricultural activities of England, we suppose few would deny; but, admitting complete freedom of succession and transfer in land, as in all other sorts of property, to be essential to the well-being of all classes of the community, it is not so obvious to us that the substitution of innumerable small tenancies would lead of necessity to the higher prosperity of the people. The tendency of all agricultural processes to become more and more distinctly scientific, seems to us to offer many obstacles to the adoption of the small proprietary system in the future; but the possibility of obtaining a few acres of land, held out to the more provident members of our peasant class, could not fail to stimulate the ambition, and so diminish the pauperization, of the starveling hinds who, under existing circumstances, have nothing to look forward to in their old age but the workhouse allowance, or such petty government annuity as their exceptional far-sightedness may have secured for them.

As for the waste lands of the country, though Captain Maxse about a year since favoured the readers of the *Fort-*

nightly Review with a very carefully tabulated map indicative of the huge areas still uncultivated and awaiting the spade or plough, we confess that it is not in that direction we look for the reduction of our pauper-roll; and with the boundless fields of undeveloped fertility opening year by year across the Atlantic to the ordinarily provident members of our poorer classes, we can hardly hope to see the grouse lands of Scotland or the moors of North Devon converted into the smiling fields and fat pastures which the more sanguine advocates of "waste labour to waste lands" seem to anticipate. With the withdrawal of child-labour from the fields, and the consequent better wages of those who are left to do the work, and with a more elastic system of land-tenure, we cannot doubt the average condition of the British peasant would be much improved; and, despite what Mr. Froude and others have written to the contrary, we believe that the state of this confessedly miserable class is not even now so luckless as it was thirty years ago.

It is urged by Professor Fawcett, in common with many other reformers, that the present game-laws have much to do with the maintenance of our rural pauperism, and there is perhaps some slight force in this view; but we feel assured that the pressure of these laws, bad as they are, is almost imperceptible in its influence on the direct manufacture of paupers. The seeds of pauperism are not to be found specially in the covers of the millionnaire proprietor, or in the sweeping park-lands of the great manufacturer. The miserable cottages and the poorly furnished school-house have, in our opinion, far more to do with the degradation of the peasant than either the hall or the dog-kennels; and though it may be urged that the former are the result of the latter, we are not prepared to admit the full force of the popular arguments, till a thorough system of elementary education has been brought within reach of every child of the farm, as well as every denizen of our cities. That even in agricultural districts some plan of half-time schooling is not impossible, has been amply proved by Mr. Paget's experiment with his plough-boys in Leicestershire; and our firm conviction is, that a settled determination on the part of the Government to see the thing done in the best way possible, will secure results, even in the remotest of our rural districts, which would astonish Mr. Forster himself,

accustomed as he is to the confessedly good effects of the factory system in the manufacturing towns. We do not attempt to dispute the fact of wretchedness amongst the agricultural population, almost unparalleled, existing in England at the present time, and all the expressions used in the Reports by Rev. J. Fraser (the present Bishop of Manchester), or Mr. T. E. Kebbel in his careful little work on the "Agricultural Labourer,"* but truly describe the depth of degradation to which this class is reduced even in the richest parts of the country. Nevertheless, we do not hesitate to say that slow intelligence and want of proper early development, breeding a narrow form of local faith and miserable routine, has far more to do with the conditions we complain of than any inequitable laws or tyrannical landlords. Open the eyes of your labourers, and the oppressiveness of laws long practically obsolete will be realized and remedied. As things now are, no organization of labour is known to exist in this stratum of society, and without union in this, as in other classes, all progress is impossible. Better education will doubtless quicken these organizations, and cheaper means of locomotion will further intensify their force.

Again, the enclosure of commons, which forms another subject of disquisition for Mr. Fawcett, is intimately connected with the matters we have just treated; but in this, as in the former case, we think the Professor has much overrated the importance, in their bearings upon pauperism, of the grievances he refers to. Doubtless the poor have suffered in some ways from the enclosure of commons; but to attribute, for instance, any actual increase in the number of our paupers, or the extent of national demoralization, to the cutting off of about 400 acres at Wisley, in the neighbourhood of the Metropolis, seems to us to lay far too great a stress on mere local phenomena. For it must not be forgotten with respect to our city poor, that whilst some commons have been enclosed, other healthy places of resort, such as the Crystal Palace and Victoria Park, are now rendered easily accessible by rail, and at such rates that the great masses of the wage-earning population can avail themselves of the advantages, if they so desire. Recently, a People's Park, so called, has been opened at Willesden, mainly through the energy of a German club; and if only a sufficient number

---

* Chapman and Hall, 1870.

of working people can be interested in it so as to make it self-supporting, it may do much for the poor of some parts of the Metropolis. But open spaces within our great cities are to our mind quite as much needed as open commons outside; and those who know the grimy play-places of London children can best imagine what might be the sanitary influences of pleasant gardens and open fields in which to shake off the dust and fume of the streets. Professor Fawcett writes pathetically of a common, once sacred to the village poor, rudely wrenched from them in the North of Devonshire, at a little moorland place called Withypool, which we have reason to remember for many a pleasant fishing bout spent in it in past years. But to introduce the enclosure of a common on Exmoor as an important factor in the constitution of national pauperism, seems to us entirely a mistake; and we suspect the Professor's connection with the excellent movement for the preservation of commons may have given undue prominence in his book to a subject which otherwise would have been better treated in an essay on the agricultural resources of the country than in a general dissertation on pauperism. We suspect that, with the poor as with others, it is in themselves in great measure that they are this or that; and nothing short of individual training, adapted as far as possible to the requirements and abilities of each, will go far to keep down the ghastly deterioration which now seems to beset almost as a necessity our city populations.

We return, therefore, to the simple proposition with which we set out, that with the higher education rests also the emancipation from pauperism of our people. All other means, be they called remedies or not, are but make-believes and palliatives at the best. There is, however, one subject which presses very closely upon the question of pauperism in all its relations, which seems in a great measure to have escaped the observation of Mr. Fawcett, and that is the treatment of the sick poor. It has been shewn by Dr. Rogers, the active President of the Poor-law Medical Officers' Association, how large a proportion of our pauperism is, directly or indirectly, caused by the sickness of the poor; and as yet the legal machinery to meet the wants of the sick has been miserably inadequate. Dr. Rogers proposes the introduction of the Irish Dispensary system, under which aid given at the State Dispensaries is

not reckoned as pauper relief; but good as the Irish system may be, we confess to look with higher hopes toward some comprehensive scheme of cheap provident and self-supporting Dispensaries, by means of which the poor themselves may in the future, and with less sacrifice of their own independence or the doctor's time, make arrangements for all necessary aid without resort to either Poor-law or charity. We are well aware that this may seem to many a long look ahead, if not wholly Utopian; but we are certain that little short of it will make any perceptible impression on the ingrained debility and wretchedness of our town poor. The abuse of hospital relief, side by side with that of the workhouse, has done much to demoralize the poor, and it is to be hoped, from recent and repeated manifestations, that the medical profession is at length becoming alive to the fact and anxious for its removal. Meanwhile, any good and comprehensive plan for consolidating the present desultory and capricious methods of Poor-law medical relief cannot fail to do good, even if it does not as yet embody all the higher principles which we ourselves desire to see introduced. That public opinion is moving in this direction, is evidenced by a recent meeting at Manchester, at which a very strong sentiment in favour of the provident, as against the mere eleemosynary system, was elicited from the representatives of the leading medical charities. This method of reducing pauperism is, however, like all others that we have touched upon in this paper, intimately connected with the question of higher education; and till the people have been taught to understand its advantages, they will, we fear, go on helplessly and hopelessly in the old ruts.

We have now endeavoured to give in outline a few, and it has been only a few, of the means by which, in our opinion, national pauperism is likely to be removed; and in the main, it will be observed, we have agreed with the theoretical propositions laid down by Mr. Fawcett. Of the practical difficulties which beset the carrying out of some of the suggested remedies, we do not for a moment pretend to be ignorant, more especially those which are associated with the speedy reduction, if not entire removal, of out-door relief. On that question some of the finest feelings of the benevolent, as well as many of the prejudices of the present administrators of the law, have to be resisted; and it will only be by the gradual growth of a sound public opinion on the subject,

that the desires of the more rigid economists are likely to be attained. The narrow escapes of "a count-out" which Poor-law questions have incurred of late years, when brought under the notice of the House of Commons, make us fear that much has yet to be done from the outside before any strenuous action will be taken by the responsible authorities. It cannot, however, be any longer argued that materials are insufficient for forming an accurate and decisive judgment on the general issues, Mr. Stansfeld himself, as the mouthpiece of the department, having recently stated, in reply to Mr. W. H. Smith in asking for a Royal Commission, that the officials of the Poor-law Board formed a permanent Committee, and could at any time place the necessary information in the hands of the chiefs. We hope, therefore, Mr. Stansfeld will not hesitate to carry forward some of the work which was bequeathed to him by Mr. Goschen; and if he can hold back the tide of pauperism which, from recent statistics, in the Metropolis seems at last to be upon the turn, he will, we think, have done more for the real happiness of the people than would be effected by the best general or the most accomplished diplomatist. Without, however, a riper public opinion than now exists on this subject, we are not sanguine of any great reform, even from the ablest Ministers.

ALSAGER HAY HILL.

II.—THE READING Μονογενὴς Θεός, "THE ONLY-BEGOTTEN GOD," IN JOHN i. 18.*

AT a time when the authorized translation of the English Bible is undergoing revision, questions of textual criticism,

---

* The material for this article was nearly all collected before I had the advantage of seeing Mr. E. Abbot's exhaustive treatment of the same subject in two articles, one in an Appendix to the last edition of Norton's "Statement of Reasons," the other in the Bibliotheca Sacra, of Andover, October 1861. These articles may seem to render the present contribution superfluous. But as the subject has a peculiar interest just now, as my investigation has been quite independent, and as the treatment varies in some respects from Mr. Abbot's, the present article is offered to those readers who may not have already studied the question.

which ordinarily possess a charm only for those scholars who have paid special attention to that department of study, acquire a more general interest. The labours which have hitherto affected only the Greek text, will now present their more important results in the popular language; and some of these results will inevitably engage the attention of many persons who have hitherto been content to regard the current version as a faithful representative of the original. In reference to several of the required changes, there will, no doubt, be but one opinion among the learned revisionists. The text of the three heavenly witnesses (1 John v. 7) will, it may be assumed, find no advocate; "God was manifest in the flesh" (1 Tim. iii. 16), will be changed into "Who," or "He who was manifest in the flesh;" and most probably "The church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood" (Acts xx. 28), will be altered without much debate into "The church of the Lord," &c. There are, however, some passages about which a difference of opinion may fairly arise; and among these is John i. 18 ["No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him"], where, for the old reading, "the only-begotten Son," the recent critical edition of Dr. Tregelles has substituted the reading, "only-begotten God." Dr. Tregelles so long ago as 1854 expressed his decided conviction that this was the true reading.* The discovery of the Sinaitic manuscript, which contains this reading, could only confirm his opinion. The late lamented Dean of Canterbury, however, in his last edition of his Greek Testament, decides in favour of the ordinary reading, which is also retained by Tischendorf in his eighth edition.

The evidence for and against this remarkable variation may be so presented as to bring it within the judgment of intelligent readers, even though they may not have paid any particular attention to critical studies. It need hardly be said that it is purely a question of fact, and that all desire to maintain this or that set of theological opinions must be absolutely excluded from our minds, if we wish to form an unprejudiced opinion.

There are three great sources of evidence, which must be examined in their order: 1, Greek manuscripts; 2, early

---

* "An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek Testament," pp. 234, 235.

translations into various languages; 3, the writings of the Fathers in which passages in the New Testament are quoted or referred to.

I. MANUSCRIPTS. If mere numbers could be decisive in a question of this kind, our investigation would be brief; for an immense majority of manuscripts support the reading Μονογενὴς υἱός [only-begotten Son]. But the antiquity and the excellence of manuscripts must also be taken into consideration; and of those which occupy the first position in these respects, a majority favour the reading Μονογενὴς Θεός [only-begotten God]. These manuscripts are the Sinaitic (ℵ),* the Vatican (B), and the Codex Ephremi (C), of which the two former may belong to the fourth century, and the last to the fifth. In C, the word "God" has been corrected into "Son" by a later hand. These ancient authorities are followed by only two of a later date: the Codex Regius (L), an uncial manuscript of great value, of about the eighth or ninth century; and a cursive manuscript (33) of the eleventh century. This is the whole of the evidence from manuscripts in favour of the reading "God;" namely, three manuscripts of the very highest authority, and two which are esteemed valuable among the later codices on account of the general excellence of their text.

In favour of the reading "Son," there is only one manuscript of the first importance, the Alexandrine (A), which is assigned to the fifth century. The Codex Bezæ (D), which is referred to the sixth century, is unfortunately defective in this passage, so that its reading is not known. Among the later uncial manuscripts, the Codex Monacensis (X), assigned to the tenth century, and the Codex Sangallensis (Δ), of the ninth century, are esteemed particularly valuable; and these, with the other uncials, ranging from the eighth to the tenth century, exhibit the reading "Son." Among the cursives, those numbered 1 and 69 are considered espe-

---

* Mr. Abbot cites the Sinaitic, *as corrected*, in favour of the reading υἱός [Son]. At the time when his article was written he had not had the advantage of consulting Tischendorf's edition. The fact is, there is no correction of the word θεός [God]. The first writer had omitted the words ὁ ὢν, and Tischendorf has this note:—"εις: corrector cujus scriptura atque atramentum ab A differt, fortasse idem quem B nuncupavimus, ο ων εις reposuit." We have therefore distinct evidence that this verse was corrected; and nevertheless θεός was allowed to stand. Either the corrector was inadvertent, or the word is confirmed as a reading accepted at the time when the correction was made.

cially valuable; and these, as well as the general crowd of cursives, contain the same reading.

In endeavouring to estimate the force of this evidence, we must remark that B, C, L and 33, have, in the Gospels, such a striking affinity in their readings, that Griesbach classes them together in what he calls the Alexandrine Recension. ℵ, which has been discovered since his time, may be classed with these, its relationship with B being particularly close. Now, whether we accept Griesbach's theory of recensions or not, this affinity among manuscripts is a point of great importance; for if any particular reading be supported only by manuscripts which have sprung from a common source, or represent the text only of one region, the evidence in its favour is much less weighty than it would be if it were supported by precisely the same number of manuscripts, but by such as had originated under different influences, and represented the text of widely separated regions. That diversity of origin is more important than numbers, is as sound a rule in regard to the more ancient as in regard to the more recent manuscripts; and diversity is precisely what is wanting in the present instance. A, representing in the Gospels a different form of text from the authorities above mentioned, although probably written at Alexandria, contains the reading "Son;" while not a single manuscript that bears no traces of Alexandrine influence contains the other reading. All, then, that the facts warrant us in stating is, that the reading Θεός [God] was known, and to some extent used, in Egypt in the fourth and fifth centuries (for L and 33 can only be regarded as representing an Egyptian text of a period long anterior to their own date); that it was not universally used there; and that there is no manuscript evidence of its having been used anywhere else. The internal evidence for the readings will be noticed farther on; meanwhile, when we consider them merely as occurring in certain documents, does it not seem more probable that the reading Θεός [God] was either introduced inadvertently, or adopted in a particular region at a particular period for certain special reasons, and therefore appears in most of the oldest and best manuscripts, which have come from that region and that period, than that a genuine reading should have been changed by unanimous

consent in all other manuscripts, including one of the highest, and several of respectable, authority?

II. VERSIONS. We must now consider the evidence of the early translations.

1. The Latin Version, in both its older and its later form, supports the reading "Son."

2. The Syriac Versions give conflicting evidence.

The oldest form of the text is probably represented by the *Curetonian Syriac.* This consists of fragments of the Gospels, contained in a very ancient manuscript, probably of the fifth century, which was obtained in the year 1842 by Archdeacon Tattam, from the Syrian monastery dedicated to St. Mary Deipara, in the valley of the Natron Lakes. These fragments were edited and translated by the Rev. W. Cureton in 1858, and are believed by the learned editor, and by others who have followed up his inquiries, to represent a very early text. This Version favours the reading *υἱός* [Son].

The *Peshito* Syriac stands next in importance, as its original form may be as old as the second century. Griesbach believed that this Version had been frequently revised.* His judgment has been confirmed by further research, and Dr. Tregelles says "it was frequently modernized from time to time."† This circumstance diminishes its value as a witness of the most ancient text. It favours Θεός [God].

The *Philoxenian* Syriac Version was made in the neighbourhood of Antioch, in the year 508. Its text was revised about the year 616 by Thomas of Harkel, in a monastery in Alexandria. He collated in the Gospels two or three "ancient Greek manuscripts" belonging to the monastery, noting the results in the margin. In many places he has altered the Philoxenian text, and has probably not in every instance mentioned the fact. Our present passage does not seem to be one of these; for the text supports the reading *υἱός* [Son], while the margin favours Θεός [God]. It is probable, therefore, that the original version contained the ordinary reading, and the reading in the margin was derived

---

* "Diversis ergo temporibus ad græcos codices plane diversos iterum iterumque recognita esse videtur." Greek Test. Prol. p. lxxvii, London edition of 1809.

† Greek Test., in the preliminary remarks.

from Egyptian manuscripts of perhaps the fourth or fifth century.

Lastly, the *Jerusalem* Syriac, a Gospel Lectionary, assigned by Tischendorf to the fifth century, by others placed later, also supports the reading *υἱός* [Son].

It seems, then, that the evidence of the Syriac Versions, though divided, preponderates on the side of the common reading.

3. The *Memphitic* Version, made in Lower Egypt, probably about the end of the third century, though by some placed later, supports the reading Θεὸς [God]. This version, we may suppose, was made from Greek copies at Alexandria.

4. The *Æthiopic* Version is of uncertain date, but is not earlier than the fourth century, and probably not much later. Its evidence is not in a very satisfactory state. The first printed edition, published at Rome, under the editorship of three Abyssinians, in 1548-9, supports the reading Θεός [God]. This edition contained several errors, and cannot be regarded as possessing a very high critical value. A better edition was published under the direction of Mr. T. P. Platt, in 1826-30, founded on a collation of manuscripts. This edition favours *υἱός* [Son].

5. The *Armenian* Version was made from a Greek codex brought from Ephesus in 431.* Manuscripts from Alexandria may also have been used, as two students were sent to that city, in order to perfect themselves in Greek, for the work of translation; and they would probably bring some manuscripts with them. This version supports *υἱός* [Son].

It appears, therefore, that the evidence of the Versions preponderates on the side of *υἱός* [Son]. The Latin in both its forms, and the Armenian, unequivocably support it. The Memphitic alone supports Θεός [God] without any room for question. The best edition of the Æthiopic supports *υἱός* [Son]. The Syriac inclines in the same direction, though the counter-evidence of the Peshito is important. It deserves remark that, with the exception of the Peshito (though *perhaps* it is not an exception in this instance), those versions which support Θεός [God] have been under Alexan-

---

* Tischendorf (8th edition of Greek Test. p. xvi) and Tregelles, in their Prolegomena, strangely assign it to the *fourth* century.

drine influence; and they, therefore, only sustain the fact already learned from the manuscripts, that this was a reading used in Egypt in the fourth and fifth centuries. The case of the Peshito is peculiar; but there is nothing to decide whether this passage represents the original form of the version, or whether it has been altered under Alexandrine influence.

III. FATHERS. Before proceeding to give in detail the evidence from the Fathers, a few words must be said as to the nature of this evidence. It would be a great mistake to suppose that we have nothing to do but count the number of times that a passage of Scripture is quoted in any particular form, in order to arrive at the reading received by the early Church. A careful examination of the original works of the Fathers sometimes leaves on the mind a very different impression from that which is derived from the summary statement of the critical editions of the Greek Testament. If the Scripture passage is merely quoted, and there is nothing in the context to *fix* the particular reading which is in question, very little weight can be attached to the special words which are used. In such cases there are two great sources of uncertainty. In the first place, the author may have originally quoted loosely and from memory, giving the general sense, but slightly altering the words. We know that this was frequently done, and that we must accordingly be very careful in attaching any importance to mere verbal alterations. But, in addition to this uncertainy, we cauntot feel sure what the author himself originally wrote; for his works have been exposed to all the errors of transcription, and in all probability the Scripture quotations have suffered most from these errors. To go no farther than the present passage, in place of the true reading *εἰς τὸν κόλπον*, we have *ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ*, and *ἐν τοῖς κόλποις* [Basil], and *εἰς τοὺς κόλπους* [Pseudo-Ignatius]; for *τοῦ πατρός, τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρός* [Cyril of Al.]; for *ἐκεῖνος, αὐτός* [Hippolytus and Didymus], *οὗτος* and *οὗτος ἡμῖν* [Basil]; and for *ἐξηγήσατο, διηγήσατο* [Hippol.]. The mere occurrence, then, of a passage of Scripture in any particular form, appears to be a circumstance of the least possible weight, and especially when it is not introduced as an express quotation. Occasionally, however, a reading is conclusively determined by the use which is made of it in the context; for

instance, by an express reference to it as a reading found in some copies, or by its being employed as the basis of an argument. Sometimes, too, the absence of any distinct allusion to a reading which would have been useful to the argument, may be taken as some indication that it was not known to the writer, although it is now found in the text of his works. It is necessary to examine each quotation separately, and consider the connection in which it occurs, in order that we may form a due estimate of its comparative value. With these cautions, we may proceed to examine the numerous references to the present passage as fully as our limits will permit.

1. The first testimony to be noticed is that contained in the Epistles which have been ascribed to Ignatius. In the Epistle to the Philippians, chap. ii., having shewn from Scripture that there is "one God and Father," the writer goes on to say, "There is also one Son, the Word who is God [*Λόγος Θεός*]; for (the Scripture) says, 'the only-begotten, who is in the bosom of the Father' [*ὁ μονογενὴς γὰρ, φησὶν, ὁ ὢν εἰς τοὺς κόλπους τοῦ Πατρός*]." Here the sense requires the stress to be laid on the word "*only*," and probably no importance need be attached to the fact that the adjective is used absolutely. The passage is evidently quoted from memory, as we may judge from the reading *εἰς τοὺς κόλπους*, and *υἱός* [Son] is the word which the connection would lead us to supply. It may be said, however, that the writer in his own mind supplied *Θεός* [God], because in the Epistle to the Philadelphians (ch. vi. in the larger form) he uses these words: "If any one says that there is one God, and confesses also Christ Jesus, but supposes that the Lord is mere man, not only-begotten God [*Θεὸν μονογενῆ*] &c., such a one is a serpent." There is, however, no indication that the expression here used is quoted. It may, like *σαρκοφόρον Θεόν* [ad Smyrn. ch. v.], have been formed by the writer himself, though doubtless representing in his opinion a scriptural idea, and cannot, therefore, be legitimately used as any evidence of the reading in the passage under examination.

2. In coming to the testimony of Irenæus, we suffer under the disadvantage of being forced to rely upon a Latin translation of his works. He quotes the passage in three places. In the first [Contra Hær. lib. iii. cap. xi. 6], he is

engaged in proving the identity of the Creator of the world and the Father of the Lord. Having alluded to the miracles of the loaves and of the change of water into wine, he proceeds to remark that in this way it was shewn "that God who made the earth and ordered it to bear fruit, and who formed water and produced fountains, gives to mankind both the benediction of food and the grace of drink in the last times through his Son [per Filium suum], the incomprehensible through the comprehensible, and the invisible through the visible; since he is not external to him, but exists in the bosom of the Father. For it says, 'no one has ever seen God, except the only-begotten Son of God [unigenitus Filius Dei], who is in the bosom of the Father, he has declared him.' For that Son [Filius], who is in his bosom, declares to all men the Father who is invisible." Here the repetition of the word "*Son*" seems to leave little room for doubt that it was the reading with which Irenæus was familiar. The variation "Filius *Dei*" may have resulted from a failure of memory. The passage is quoted without this variation in the same work [lib. iv. cap. xx. 6]; and the reading seems fixed by the words which immediately follow,—"therefore the Son of the Father [Filius Patris] declares him from the beginning." The form of inference would surely have been different had Irenæus read "Deus." The reading "Unigenitus Deus" [only-begotten God] occurs a little farther on [section 11]. There is nothing whatever in the context to determine the correctness of this reading; and the question may be fairly raised whether it represents the form in which the quotation occurred in the original work. It may be contended that a Latin transcriber was not likely to introduce the change, as the Latin Fathers and Version alike support the reading Filius. But to this it may be replied, that the *expression* "unigenitus Deus" was familiar to some of the Latin Fathers, and it would not be surprising that a transcriber whose ear was accustomed to the phrase should have occasionally introduced it through mistake. It seems probable that this was the case in the present instance, when we remember that the reading "Filius" is fixed by the other two quotations, and that it is unlikely that Irenæus was acquainted with this variation in the text, and used indiscriminately one reading or the other, without any intimation of so remarkable a fact.

3. Tertullian twice refers to the passage. In the treatise Adv. Praxean [cap. viii.], while speaking of the system of Valentinus, and of the Æon who is unable to know his father, he remarks, "but among us the Son alone [solus filius] knows the Father, and has declared the bosom of the Father [sinum Patris ipse exposuit]." The passage is more fully quoted in chapter xv. of the same work, and with the reading "Son" [unigenitus filius, qui esse (or *est?*) in sinu Patris ipse disseruit]. Had Tertullian been acquainted with the other reading, he could hardly have failed to notice it in this treatise; for he tries to shew from Scripture the propriety of calling Christ God, though in a subordinate sense.

4. Clement of Alexandria only once quotes the passage [Stromata, lib. v.; in Migne, Vol. II. col. 121], and here the form at present found is *ὁ μονογενὴς Θεός* [the only-begotten God]. There is nothing whatever in the context to fix this as the genuine reading. He refers to the passage in the book, Quis Dives salvetur [cap. xxxvii.]: *καὶ τότε ἐποπτεύσεις τὸν κόλπον τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὃν ὁ μονογενὴς Υἱὸς Θεὸς μόνος ἐξηγήσατο* ["Then thou shalt be initiated into the bosom of the Father, whom the only-begotten Son, who is God, alone declared"]. This certainly throws doubt upon the accuracy of the previous quotation. When we consider that Clement quotes the passage only once in his writings, that he refers to it again with a different reading, that he is not remarkable for accuracy in his scriptural quotations generally, and that we cannot feel absolutely certain that we have in this passage the genuine text of Clement, we cannot but consider the evidence very trifling that the reading Θεός [God] was known and accepted in his time.

5. In the treatise entitled "Excerpta ex Theodoto," which is printed with the works of Clement of Alexandria, the passage is quoted with the reading Θεός [God]. [Migne, ii. col. 657.] The passage requires a little examination, for it does not seem to me such a weighty testimony as it does to Mr. Abbot. It runs thus: "The passage, 'In the beginning was the Word, &c. . . .' the followers of Valentinus receive in this way. For they say the Only-begotten is the Beginning, who also, they say, is called God, as also in what follows he clearly indicates him as God by saying, 'the only-begotten God, who is in the bosom of the Father,'"

&c. [*ἀρχὴν γὰρ τὸν μονογενῆ λέγουσιν, ὃν καὶ Θεὸν προσαγορεύεσθαι, ὡς καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἑξῆς ἄντικρυς Θεὸν αὐτὸν δηλοῖ λέγων, Μονογενὴς Θεὸς κ. τ. λ.*]. It seems to me that the reading Θεός here is by no means certain. It is rendered suspicious by a reference to the passage a few lines farther on: "The only-begotten Son who remained in the bosom of the Father" [*ὁ μὲν μείνας μονογενὴς υἱὸς εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ Πατρὸς, κ. τ. λ.*]. The words *ἄντικρυς δηλοῖ* do not fix the reading, for they suggest a *clear inference* quite as much as an *express statement*. The author, when he refers to distinct naming, uses, as we have seen, *λέγουσι* and *προσαγορεύεσθαι*; and presently we have *αὐτὸν* [that is, the Logos] *Θεὸν λέγει*. I am inclined, therefore, to think that the copyists were misled in the present instance by the apparent necessity for Θεός, and that the original writer meant to denote that the Godhead of the Only-begotten had been inferred from the fact that he was in the bosom of the Father,—an argument which, we know, was used in later times.

6. The testimony of Origen is unfortunately not in a satisfactory condition. In the Commentary on John [iv. 177, Migne; iv. 89, De La Rue), the passage is quoted with the reading *θεός* [God], in the present editions. There is nothing in the context to fix this reading, so that it rests entirely on the authority of manuscripts. Now the Latin translation of Ferrari, published in 1551 from a Venetian manuscript no longer known, and which in the present passage is baldly literal, reads "unigenitus" [only-begotten] alone; and this fact suggests the consideration that if we had as ample resources for revising the text of the Fathers as we have for emending that of the New Testament itself, some anomalous readings might disappear. The reading *θεός* [God] appears again in a later portion of the same work [iv. 800, Migne; iv. 438, De La Rue]. Here also there is nothing to fix the reading.* In the same work [iv. 201, Migne; iv. 102, De La Rue], the passage is quoted with the reading, *ὁ μονογενὴς Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ*. This is the reading of the Bodleian Codex. The edition of Huet, founded on a

* Mr. Abbot says that here also Ferrari has "unigenitus" alone. Migne's edition, which I have used, has "unigenitus Deus." We may learn from this what uncertainty attends manuscripts and editions, when there is nothing in the context to determine the reading.

single manuscript, has Τὶὸς Θεὸς [the only-begotten Son, who is God]. This fact exemplifies the uncertainty of manuscripts. The Latin translation has "unigenitus Filius Dei" [Son of God]. In the same passage Origen refers to the words, and has simply *τὸν μονογενῆ εἰς τὸν κόλπον ὄντα τοῦ Πατρός* [the only-begotten who is in, &c.]. The passage is quoted once again in Contra Celsum [lib. ii. 440]. De La Rue gives the words in the received form [*ὁ μ. υἱὸς κ. τ. λ.*] from the Codices Regius and Basiliensis. The printed copies previously had *καὶ μονογενὴς γὲ ὢν Θεὸς ὁ ὢν κ. τ. λ.* [and only-begotten, being God, &c.]. This is like a marginal gloss, and may give us some clue to the origin of the reading Θεός. The Latin translation published by De La Rue (in Migne's edition, which alone I have consulted) reads "unigenitus Deus" [only-begotten God]. Were it not, therefore, for the happy preservation of two superior manuscripts, this passage would be cited for, and not against, the reading Θεός; for, as in the other instances from Origen, the context gives us no help. As a small further contribution of evidence, it must be mentioned that the words are quoted in the translation by Rufinus (distinguished for his inaccuracy) of the work, In Canticum Canticorum [lib. iv. vers. 13, 14; in Migne, Vol. III. col. 193]. In this place we have Unigenitus Dei Filius [Son of God], though in a previous reference we have simply Unigenitus Filius [Son]. In considering this contradictory evidence of Origen's reading, we must remark that it is most improbable that Origen was familiar with *both* readings. He was the prince of biblical critics of his time; and it is most unlikely that, had he been aware of this remarkable variation, he would have taken no notice of it, but used indiscriminately sometimes one reading and sometimes the other. I can have little doubt, therefore, that in one or the other form of quotation the manuscripts of his works have been corrupted; but there is nothing in his own quotations, *taken alone*, to decide which reading was the one used by him.

7. Hippolytus [Contra Noetum, v.] quotes the passage with the reading *υἱός*. He introduces the quotation by saying that "no one sees God except the Son [*παῖς*, a different word in Greek from that generally rendered "Son"] and perfect man, who alone declared the counsel of the Father;

for John says," &c. [*ὁρῶν δὲ τὸν Θεὸν οὐδ' εἷς, εἰ μὴ μόνος ὁ παῖς καὶ τέλειος ἄνθρωπος καὶ μόνος διηγησάμενος τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ Πατρός· λέγει γὰρ καὶ Ἰωάννης, Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε· μονογενὴς Υἱὸς, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ Πατρὸς, αὐτὸς διηγήσατο*]. There is nothing further in the context to fix the reading, and the variation in the closing words suggests that the quotation was given from memory.

8. In the Synodical Epistle of the Antiochene Council, which condemned Paul of Samosata, the passage is quoted in its usual form. [Routh. Rel. Sac. iii. p. 297.]

9. More interesting and important is the testimony of Eusebius. Most of his quotations of our passage occur in his work, De Ecclesiasticâ Theologiâ contra Marcellum. An allusion is supposed to be made to the passage in lib. i. c. iv. [19 in the Paris edition], where he refers to the creed of Marcellus, "To believe on the Father, God omnipotent, and on his Son, the only-begotten God [*εἰς τὸν Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ Θεὸν*], our Lord Jesus Christ, and on the Holy Spirit;" and Eusebius adds that Marcellus declared that he had learned this creed from the Holy Scriptures. There is, however, no evidence that Marcellus intended to quote the exact language of Scripture; and he may very well have supposed that *τὸν μονογενῆ Θεόν* expressed the true sense of Scripture. The next reference is in lib. i. c. ix. [67], where the passage is quoted with the reading *ὁ μονογενὴς Υἱὸς ἢ μονογενὴς Θεός* [the only-begotten Son or only-begotten God]. This might be taken to shew that Eusebius was acquainted with both readings. But he makes no allusion to any uncertainty in the reading, and in the same chapter he has the expressions, *μονογενὴς τοῦ Θεοῦ, μονογενῆ Υἱὸν Θεοῦ, Υἱὸν μονογενῆ*. Still further, he introduces the quotation with the words, *τοῦ τε εὐαγγελιστοῦ διαῤῥήδην αὐτὸν Υἱὸν μονογενῆ εἶναι διδάσκοντος δι' ὧν ἔφη* [the evangelist expressly teaching that he is only-begotten Son by what he said]. Eusebius proceeds to quote the passage, "God so loved the world," &c., and then concludes his argument by saying that those who maintained that the Son was created out of nothing, denied that he was really a *Son*. There seems, therefore, to be no reason to doubt that Eusebius here read "only-begotten Son," and that only; and consequently the other words, "only-begotten God," must be due to the uncertainty of a transcriber. The passage is

expressly quoted in its usual form in lib. i. c. xx. [86]. The writer has just shewn that Christ is called in Scripture, Λόγος, Θεός, and Φῶς [Word, God, and Light], and then has a section devoted to the title *μονογενής* [only-begotten]. Throughout this section, Christ is spoken of as "the only-begotten *Son*," or simply "only-begotten." Having quoted the passage, he immediately remarks, "The only-begotten Son himself declared this. Therefore the invisible God did not declare it, but the only-begotten Son, having become visible, made to men the declaration concerning the Father.' A little lower down he repeats, "the Son was in the bosom of the Father." And farther on [p. 92], speaking of the evangelist, he says, "He called him not only Logos, but also God, and Light which lightens every man coming into the world, and only-begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father" [*καὶ μονογενῆ Υἱὸν τὸν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ Πατρός*]. The reading is thus abundantly confirmed. But, further, it seems utterly improbable that Eusebius, when he wrote this section, can have even known of the existence of the reading *μονογενὴς* Θεός. If he had, he would have referred to it among his proofs that Christ was called God, and in treating of the title *μονογενής* [only-begotten] he could not have failed to notice so remarkable an adjunct. The obvious inference is, either that the learned men of the Church at that time were not acquainted with the reading Θεός [God], or that they considered it so unquestionably spurious as not to be worth notice. In lib. ii. c. xiv. [124], he is explaining the doctrine of the first chapter of John's Gospel; and here, though there is no express quotation of the whole clause, the words *μονογενὴς* Υἱός occur five times, and there is no allusion to the other reading. Dr. Tregelles, indeed, refers to this passage in support of the reading Θεός. The only words that can be supposed to serve this purpose are Θεὸν δὲ *καὶ* Μονογενῆ [God *and* Only-begotten]. Surely the critic was here too eager to establish a point. The passage, so far from confirming the reading Θεός [God], contains an interesting argument which seems to me to prove that Eusebius was not even acquainted with it. He says that Υἱός [Son] may be substituted for Λόγος [Word], so that for Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος [the Word was God], we may read Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Υἱός [the Son was God]. He also infers from the passage, "that which is born of the flesh is flesh." &c., that in

the same way that which is born of God would be God. Is it probable that a writer would use these arguments in commenting on the first chapter of John, and yet omit all mention of a verse in that chapter in which Christ was called God, not by inference, but expressly, had he known of the existence of such a verse? In lib. ii. c. xxiii. [142], he speaks of John as declaring that in the beginning was the Word, &c., and goes on, "clearly presenting his sonship [*τὴν τε υἱότητα σαφῶς παριστῶντος*], by saying of the Father, 'No one has ever seen God;' but of the Son, 'The only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.'" The word *υἱότητα* [sonship] seems to fix the reading. In lib. iii. c. vi. [175], he speaks of the doctrine of the Church in regard to the Father, the Son and the Spirit; and having quoted the passage, "one Lord, one faith.....one God and Father of all," he proceeds: "And he alone would take the title of one God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, but the Son that of only-begotten God, who is in the bosom of the Father [*ὁ δὲ υἱὸς (χρηματίζοι ἂν) μονογενὴς Θεὸς, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ Πατρὸς*], but the advocate Spirit that of neither God nor Son,"* &c. Now the words here used do not profess to be an explicit quotation; and Eusebius has probably employed the word *Θεός* [God] here because he is giving a summary statement of the doctrine of the Church. The fact that he knew the *ecclesiastical* expression *μονογενὴς Θεός* [only-begotten God], confirms the arguments above advanced to shew that he did not know it as a *scriptural* expression. Lastly, the passage is quoted in the Comment. in Psalmos, lxxiii. 11 [v. 860, in Migne] in the received form, except that the article is not prefixed to *μονογενής*. There is nothing to fix the reading.

10. The testimony of Athanasius is very valuable. In the work, De Decretis Nicenæ Synodi, c. xiii. [i. 448, Migne], in distinguishing the Lord from things created, he quotes the passage in its usual form, and adds, "if therefore he is a Son, he is not a creature; but if a creature, not a Son" [*εἰ τοίνυν υἱὸς, οὐ κτίσμα· εἰ δὲ κτίσμα, οὐχ υἱός*]. These words seem to fix the reading. In the same work, c. xxi.,

* So I translate *τὸ δὲ παράκλητον πνεῦμα οὔτε θεὸς οὔτε υἱός*. Mr. Abbot translates, "but the Paraclete, [may be called] Spirit, but neither God nor Son." For this rendering I should expect *ὁ παράκλητος*, and some word corresponding to "but."

having again quoted it in the same form, he adds, "for what else does the expression *in the bosom* [here ἐν κόλποις] signify, but the genuine birth of the Son from the Father?" [τὴν γνησίαν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς τοῦ Υἱοῦ γέννησιν]. This to some extent confirms the reading. In the Orat. cont. Arianos, ii. c. lxii. [ii. 280, Migne], it is quoted in the usual form; but there is nothing to fix the reading. In the same work, iv. 26 [ii. 508, Migne], is the following passage: "That which is said in John, 'the only-begotten Son [ὁ μον. Υἱὸς] who is in the bosom of the Father,' shews that the Son [τὸν Υἱὸν] exists always. For him whom John calls 'Son' [Υἱὸν], David calls 'Hand,' when he says, 'Why withdrawest thou thy hand and thy right hand from the midst of thy bosom?' Therefore if the hand is in the bosom, and the Son is in the bosom, the Son must be the hand, and the hand the Son" [ὁ Υἱὸς ἂν εἴη ἡ χεὶρ, καὶ ἡ χεὶρ ἂν εἴη ὁ Υἱός]. This conclusively fixes the reading.

11. The evidence of Didymus, of Alexandria, is in favour of the reading Θεός [God]; but it requires a little criticism. In the work De Trinitate, lib. i. c. xv. [p. 27], he uses these words: "As the Father has been declared to be one God, so the Son has been called only-begotten God Word, and one Lord Jesus Christ" [ὥσπερ ὁ Πατὴρ, Εἷς Θεὸς, εἴρηται· οὕτω ὁ Υἱὸς κέκληται Μονογενὴς Θεὸς Λόγος καὶ Εἷς Κύριος κ. τ. λ.]. Now it is quite arbitrary in this passage to place a comma after Θεός [God] and none after μονογενής [only-begotten]. The three words may be taken separately, or (as I think better) all together. In either case the clause ceases to render any support to the reading Θεός; in the former case, obviously; in the latter, because μον. Θεὸς Λόγος [only-begotten God Word] is not a scriptural expression, but only an expression supposed to be legitimately formed out of the words of Scripture. Reasons for taking the words all together are, first, that μονογενής [only-begotten] is evidently taken as equivalent to εἷς [one], and as qualifying Θεὸς Λόγος, whereas the connection furnishes no ground for introducing Θεός, or Λόγος, without the qualifying word; and, secondly, that Didymus uses that precise expression farther on [p. 75], where he is speaking of Abraham's intended sacrifice of Isaac, "it was the only-begotten God Word who sought the sacrifice" [ἦν ὁ τὴν θυσίαν ζητήσας μονογενὴς Θεὸς Λόγος]. In lib. i. c. xxvi.

[p. 76], the passage is quoted with the reading Θεός [God], but also with the variations *ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ*, and *αὐτός*, shewing that the passage has either suffered from transcription or been quoted inaccurately from memory. There is nothing in the context to fix the reading Θεός, but, on the contrary, something to render it doubtful. He has been speaking of Christ sitting at the right hand of God, and being in his bosom, as a proof that the only-begotten God and Son [*τὸν μονογενῆ Θεὸν καὶ Υἱόν*] should receive equal honour and worship with the Father and the Spirit; and he goes on to say that the Evangelist by divine inspiration declared that the paternal bosom was a becoming seat for the *Son* [*καθέδραν πρέπουσαν τῷ Υἱῷ τὸν πατρικὸν εἶναι κόλπον*]. This is a palpable allusion to our passage, and favours the reading "Son." After two other quotations, the passage is quoted in the form given above. The following chapter furnishes negative evidence that Didymus was unacquainted with the reading Θεός [God]. It adduces those passages which shew that the Son is God, and among them the exclamation of Thomas; but no notice is taken of our present passage. The weight of this evidence is, however, somewhat diminished by the fact that the first chapter of John is not taken into consideration in this place. As illustrating the critical value of Didymus's quotations, it may be mentioned that in the same chapter he quotes 1 Tim. iii. 16 with the reading *Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη*. The passage is again quoted with the reading Θεός [God] in lib. ii. c. v. [p. 140]. Here also there is a variation, *ἐν τοῖς κόλποις*, which throws uncertainty upon the accuracy of the quotation; and there is nothing in the context to fix the reading. The quotation occurs in a passage where the epithet only-begotten is more than once applied to "the God Word" [*ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος*], and where it is stated that we believe that the only-begotten Word [*τὸν μον. Λόγον*] is God equally with the Father, and where also we have the expression, "the only-begotten Son." The declaration, "the God Word was called only-begotten" [*μονογενὴς ἐκλήθη ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος*], deserves special notice, as illustrating the way in which inferences may be converted into assertions of positive statement, and as shewing that the mere juxtaposition of scriptural words in an early writer cannot be taken as evidence of their original juxtaposition. The im-

mediate connection in which the quotation stands is the following: "As, therefore, Paul has written to the Romans, Galatians and Timothy, 'God is one' [Εἷς ὁ Θεός], so concerning the Son [τοῦ Υἱοῦ] John said, 'the only-begotten God, who is in the bosom of the Father;' but concerning the Holy Spirit Paul taught the Corinthians, 'to another gifts of healing in the one Spirit' [*ἐν τῷ ἑνὶ πνεύματι*]." It is evident that here the emphasis is on *μονογενής* [only-begotten], and that the reading "Son" would be at least as suitable to the context as "God." On the whole, then, the evidence of Didymus does not seem very important. The fact that he has made no controversial use whatever of the reading Θεός [God] appears to me to more than outweigh the testimony of two quotations, for the accuracy of which we are entirely dependent on transcribers.

12. The evidence of Basil, like that of Origen, is dubious. In the treatise, De Spiritu Sancto, c. vi., he is proving that the glory of the Son is equal to that of the Father, and he adduces several passages in support of his position, ending with "the only-begotten God who is in the bosom of the Father." The words, "the only-begotten God," are wanting in one manuscript, but occur in five others. Two manuscripts read *ἐν τοῖς κόλποις*, and another *ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ*. These variations are sufficient to render the reading somewhat uncertain. The context would lead us to expect the reading "Son;" for he immediately goes on, "considering none of these things, they assign to the Son [*τῷ Υἱῷ*] the place set apart for the enemies. For the paternal bosom is a becoming seat for the Son [*κόλπος μὲν γὰρ πατρικὸς Υἱῷ καθέδρα πρέπουσα*]." Farther on he has *τοῦ μονογενοῦς* absolutely, and again *τὸν μονογενῆ Υἱόν*. In c. viii. an expression occurs which is adduced in favour of the reading Θεός [God]. In giving the reference, Dr. Tregelles emphasizes it by the word "diserte" ["expressly"]. The writer is speaking of the several names given by the Scriptures to Christ, as expressive of his nature. He mentions "true Son, and only-begotten God, and power of God, and wisdom, and Word" [*οἷδε γὰρ (ἡ Γραφὴ) τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ υἱὸν ἀληθινὸν λέγειν, καὶ μονογενῆ Θεὸν κ. τ. λ.*]. Now as "true Son" is not a scriptural expression, but only made up of words applied to Christ in separate places in Scripture, we have no ground for certainty that "only-be-

gotten God" may not be an expression formed upon the same plan, and therefore this "express" declaration of Basil's is critically worthless. In c. xi. the passage is quoted with the reading Υἱός [Son], but with the variations *ἐν τοῖς κόλποις* and *οὗτος ἡμῖν*. The context confirms the reading. He is shewing the necessity of professing belief in the Father, the Son and the Spirit; "for," he says, "he who does not believe the Spirit does not believe on the Son [*εἰς Υἱόν*], and he who has not believed the Son [*τῷ Υἱῷ*] does not believe on the Father; for neither can one say that Jesus is Lord except in the Holy Spirit, and 'no one has ever seen God, but the only-begotten Son,'" &c. Mr. Abbot calls attention to the fact that one of Matthæi's Moscow manuscripts reads Θεός [God] in this place. As the context, as well as the majority of manuscripts, supports the other reading, this may serve as an illustration of the liability of transcribers to change what I conceive to be the genuine reading into the once familiar expression, "only-begotten God." In the Epistolæ, Ep. ccxxxiv., the passage is quoted with the reading Υἱὸς [Son], and the variation *οὗτος*. Matthæi's manuscript, as Mr. Abbot remarks, here has Υἱός. There is nothing in the context to fix the reading. On the whole, then, there is room for doubt whether Basil, in spite of one quotation not unanimously supported by the manuscripts, was so much as acquainted with the reading Θεός [God].

13. Epiphanius favours the reading Θεός [God]. In the work, Adversus Hæreses [lib. ii. tom. ii. lxv. c. v.], he argues that the Word and the Father are not one person [*ἓν πρόσωπον*], as one sends and the other is sent. He then proceeds: "How then is he sent who is sent, and how does he appear through the flesh? For no one has ever seen God; the only-begotten God who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him. And he says, the only-begotten God; for the Word is begotten from the Father; but the Father was not begotten; therefore, only-begotten Son [*μον.* Υἱός]." A little farther on he says, "for he does not call the Father only-begotten; for how is he only-begotten who has not been begotten? but he calls the Son only-begotten [*τὸν δὲ Υἱὸν μονογενῆ*], in order that the Son might not be supposed to be the Father." Farther on he has the expression *ἐκ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς Θεὸς Υἱὸς μονογενής*.

The evidence, then, afforded by this passage is unsatisfactory, and even contradictory. Either Epiphanius has been very loose in his language, or the copyists very inaccurate in their transcription. In the same work [lib. iii. tom. i. lxx. c. vii.] he notices the apparent contradiction between the statement of the Scriptures that God had been seen by certain men, and the declaration, "no one has ever seen God; the only-begotten God, he declared him [*ὁ μον. Θεὸς, αὐτὸς ἐξηγήσατο*]." No use is made of the latter part of the quotation, but the chapter goes on to explain the apparent contradiction. Here, therefore, we are again dependent on the transcribers. In the Ancoratus, c. ii., the passage is quoted with the reading *ὁ μονογενής* [only-begotten] simply, and with the variation *αὐτός*. "Here," says Mr. Abbot, "the context renders it probable that *θεός* has been omitted after *μονογενής* by the mistake of a transcriber." I cannot quite concur in this judgment. If I correctly understand the argument of this rather obscure and corrupt passage, it is based, not on the expression *μονογενὴς θεός*, but on the fact that the only-begotten is in the bosom of the Father, and therefore consubstantial with him, and entitled to the same epithets. The epithet in question is *ἀληθινὸς Θεός*, which Epiphanius contends, though not used by the evangelist in relation to Christ, is nevertheless applicable to him; and he sums up the inference from our present passage in the words *ἀλλὰ μόνος ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς, ἐπειδὴ μόνος ἐκ μόνου ὁ Μονογενής*, which we may paraphrase, "the Only-begotten is 'only true God,' since he is the only sprung from the only Father." The argument, though dealing minutely with words, founds nothing on the word *θεός* in this quotation. He says, indeed, *ἐπὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ γέγραπται, ὅτι Θεὸς ὁ Υἱός* [it is written of the Son, that the Son is God]; but this probably refers to the first verse, *Υἱός* being taken as equivalent to *Λόγος*. There seems to be no reason, therefore, for supposing that a transcriber has omitted *θεός*. In the next chapter are the words, "but he who reclined on his breast is a witness worthy of credit, calling him 'only-begotten God' [*μον. θεὸν αὐτὸν φάσκων*]. But he did not add to the only-begotten God the expression true God .... but concerning the Son it is written that he is only-begotten God [*περὶ Υἱοῦ δὲ, ὅτι μον. θεός*]." Here it must be observed that there is no

quotation; and we have already seen that the expression *μον. θεός* might be regarded as truly representing John's doctrine, although the words were not placed by him in that immediate juxtaposition. No doubt the longer expression in c. viii., *Υἱὸς μονογενὴς Θεὸς ἀληθινὸς ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ* [only-begotten Son true God from true God], also appeared to be scriptural. The evidence of Epiphanius, then, is deficient in clearness and precision; and it is certainly strange, if he believed *μον. θεός* to be the true reading in John, that he has made no argumentative use of it in his writings.

14. Before leaving Epiphanius, we must notice the Epistola Pseudosynodi Ancyranæ, which is quoted in his work [Hær. lib. iii. tom. i. lxxiii. 8]. Here John is referred to as calling the Word of God only-begotten God [*τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν Λόγον μονογενῆ Θεόν*]. But there is no express quotation, and the expression here may be of the kind alluded to above. In chapter 10 of the same Epistle we have the expression *τὸν μονογενῆ Θεὸν Λόγον Υἱόν*, and although John is not cited as an authority, the first chapter of John is clearly in the writer's mind; for in the same sentence we have *πρὸς ὃν ὁ μονογενὴς ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν Θεὸς Λόγος*. The piling together of detached words into a theological formula, and the ascription of the latter to a scriptural writer, may have been legitimate in the controversies of the time, but is not a safe guide in textual criticism.

15. The evidence of Hilary is clear and unquestionable in favour of the reading "Son." We must confine our detailed notice to two passages. He refers to the passage twice with the reading Filius [Son],* and expressly quotes it four times.† One of these [De Trin. vi. 39] deserves special attention, because the context completely fixes the reading. He is proving that Christ is Son, not by adoption, but by a speciality in his nature. "Let John speak," he says, "in his own voice: No one has ever seen God except the only-begotten Son [unigenitus Filius] who is in the bosom of the Father. The faith in regard to his nature did not seem sufficiently unfolded by the name Son [Filii, which occurs only in one manuscript; but its absence

* De Trinitate, ii. 23 and v. 34.

† Ibid., iv. 8 and 42, v. 33 and vi. 39.

would not affect the sense]. . . . For besides Son [Præter filium] calling him also only-begotten, he entirely cut away the suspicion of adoption. . . . I ask what the meaning of 'only-begotten' requires? And let us see whether it can mean, as you declare, a perfect creature of God [creaturam Dei perfectam], so that 'perfect' may belong to 'only-begotten,' while 'creature' is referred to 'Son' [ad filium]." This conclusively settles Hilary's view of the passage. Yet the authority of one passage is alleged on the other side. The passage is as follows [De Trin. xii. 24]: "What was signified through Moses concerning God . . . . that the Gospels [Evangelia] attest to be proper to the only-begotten God; since, 'in the beginning was the Word,' . . . . and since 'the only-begotten God is in the bosom of the Father' [cum unigenitus Deus in sinu Patris est], and since 'Jesus Christ is God over all.'" Now here we must observe, first, that the words are not given as an express quotation; secondly, that the last statement is not in the Gospels, but the Epistle to the Romans (according to one way of pointing the passage); and, thirdly, that we have other references of the same kind, where no reliance can be placed on the wording. The following are examples: in xii. 26 are the words, "according to the Apostle the only-begotten God is before eternal time" [cum secundum Apostolum ante tempora aeterna sit unigenitus Deus]. Such a statement nowhere occurs. In ii. 1, there is a clear reference to 1 Cor. viii. 6, but in this form, "for there is one God, the Father, from whom are all things, and one only-begotten, our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things [unus unigenitus Dominus noster Jesus Christus], and one Spirit, a gift in all." Again, in obvious reference to 1 Tim. ii. 5, he says, "There is one Mediator of God and men, God and man" [Unus est enim Mediator Dei et hominum, Deus et homo]. Hilary's fondness for the expression "only-begotten God," a fondness which he shares with other writers of that and the following period, throws much light on the origin of the reading. Mr. Abbot says that he uses the expression about a hundred and four times in the treatise De Trinitate. I have not taken the trouble to count; but no one can read the treatise without being struck by the frequency of its occurrence. It should be remarked that the last reference, considered together with the fact that

we *know* that Hilary read Filius [Son], confirms our previous remarks upon the want of critical value in references of this kind.

16. Gregory of Nyssa is another writer who is fond of the expression *μονογενὴς Θεός* [only-begotten God]. But our assigned limits warn us to be brief; and we need not dwell long upon his evidence. He nowhere professes to quote our passage; but he brings it in eight times with the reading Θεός [God], twice with Υἱός [Son], and once with *ὁ ἐν ὑψίστοις* Θεός [God in the highest]. We have already seen that the mere use of words without express citation is of little or no value in settling the text. But a reference in the treatise Contra Eunomium [lib. x. vol. ii. col. 844 in Migne] seems to fix the reading "Son." He says: "For to say that the Father is in the Son [*ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ*] is equivalent to the Son's [*τὸν Υἱόν*] being in the bosom of the Father. . . . When the Son [*ὁ Υἱός*] was not, as they say, what did the bosom of the Father contain? . . . . If, then, the bosom was full, certainly the Son was the fulness of the bosom [*ὁ Υἱὸς πάντως ἦν τοῦ κόλπου τὸ πλήρωμα*]." On the other hand, I have not found that Gregory makes any argumentative use whatever of the reading Θεός [God].*

17. The evidence of Cyril is self-contradictory. In his Commentary on John, the heading of the chapter which treats of this verse contains it in its usual form. Such a heading would probably be copied from a manuscript, and not given from memory; and therefore its testimony is the more valuable. The only complete quotation of it in the commentary which follows has Θεός [God]. The *allusions* to it tell both ways. He has the following expressions: "The only-begotten being himself God, and being in the bosom of God the Father;" "He calls the Son only-begotten God, and says that he is in the bosom of the Father;" "For if he is really only-begotten God" [*εἰ γὰρ ὄντως Θεός ἐστι Μονογενής*]; and immediately after the quotation, "For when he said 'only begotten' and 'God,' he immediately adds,

* For the above paragraph I am in part indebted to Mr. Abbot, not having been able to consult the works of Gregory as fully as I should have wished. Mr. Abbot has abundantly shewn the inaccuracy of Gregory's references to scriptural phraseology. Gregory states, for instance, that Paul called Christ "only-begotten Son," though the word "only-begotten" does not occur in the writings of Paul.

'who is in the bosom of the Father,' that he may be thought of also as a Son from him" [*ἵνα νοῆται καὶ Υἱὸς ἐξ αὐτοῦ*]. On the other hand, we have, "the holy evangelist saying that the Son is in the bosom of God the Father" [*εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς τὸν Υἱὸν εἶναι*]; "we say that the Son is in the bosom of God the Father" [*τὸν Υἱὸν ἐν κόλπῳ . . . τοῦ Θεοῦ*]; and again, "when the Son is said to be in the bosom of the Father" [*ὅταν ἐν κόλπῳ λέγηται τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁ Υἱός*]. In his Thesaurus de Trinitate [137^{b}] the passage is quoted with Θεός [God]. There is nothing to fix the reading, the argument turning entirely on the first clause, "No one has seen God." The Latin translation, made by Bonaventura Vulcanius, who professes to have made it very carefully, in 1576, has "Unigenitus Filius Dei." In the same work [237^{a}] the passage is referred to with the reading Θεός [God]. There is nothing to fix it, the stress of the argument being on *μονογενής* [only-begotten]. In the same work [365^{a}] it is quoted in its usual form with Υἱός [Son]. The section in which it occurs consists of quotations and brief remarks to prove *ὅτι γενητὸς* [*sic*] *ἐκ Πατρός ἐστιν ὁ Υἱός* [that the Son is originated from the Father]. There is nothing else to fix the reading. In the De SS. Trin. Dialogus [ii. 437^{c} in Migne], he argues that if with God *create* and *beget* mean the same thing, the Scripture would be wrong in calling the Son only-begotten, and John himself would have erred in applying the title only-begotten to the Son, "who, he says, is in the bosom of God the Father" [*ἐξενεγκὼν τὸ μονογενὴς ἐφ' Υἱοῦ· ὃν δὴ ἐν κόλποις εἶναί φησι τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρός*]. This, so far as it goes, favours Υἱός [Son]. In the treatise, Quod unus sit Christus [768^{c}], he is arguing that the Son is *really* a Son [*τὸν ἀληθῶς Υἱόν, τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν Υἱοῦ*]; and in proof he quotes the words, "the only-begotten God [*θεός*] who is in the bosom of the Father," and asks, "How can one fail to be astonished at them for their ignorance, in extruding from the economy the only-begotten God Word?" [*ἐξωθοῦντας μὲν τῆς οἰκονομίας τὸν μονογενῆ Θεὸν Λόγον*]. An evidence that Cyril did not know the reading *θεός* [God] is furnished by his failure to make any controversial use of it, or to notice the existence of two readings, both of which occur in the present text of his works. The former omission is the more remarkable,

because, in referring to his Dialogues on the Trinity, he speaks of ὁ λόγος ὁ περὶ τῆς θεότητος τοῦ Μονογενοῦς [the treatise on the Godhead of the Only-begotten]. In the Scholia de Incarnatione Unigeniti [787ᵇ], where he enumerates with great fulness the titles given to Christ in Scripture, he mentions μονογενὴς καὶ Λόγος καὶ Θεός, thus separating the words μον. and Θεός [only-begotten and God], which are not combined throughout the list. But perhaps too much stress ought not to be laid upon this fact, as μ. Υἱός is also omitted, and he ends the list by referring to "many other similar names."

18. The testimony of Chrysostom is happily more explicit. In the work, De incomp. Dei Naturâ [Hom. iv. c. 3; Migne, vol. i. part ii. 731], he has a comment on the passage, in which he tries to reconcile it with Old Testament statements. He twice quotes the passage in full, with the reading Υἱός [Son], and the variation αὐτός. The following remarks upon the passage fix the reading beyond dispute: "He does not even say simply, 'the Son' [ὁ Υἱός]; though even if he had said this, it would be sufficient to bridle the mouths of the shameless men. For as there are many called Christs [χριστοί, anointed], while the true Christ is one..... so also there are many called sons, but *the* Son is one [πολλοὶ υἱοὶ λεγόμενοι, ὁ δὲ Υἱὸς εἷς]; and the addition of the article is sufficient to shew the exceptional character of the Only-begotten. But nevertheless he was not satisfied with this, but having said, 'No one has ever seen God,' he added, 'the only-begotten Son who,' &c.....First he said 'only-begotten,' and then 'Son' [Υἱός]; for since many on account of the common application of the name [διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸ ὄνομα κοινωνίαν] cut away his glory, supposing that he is one of many; for this title Son [τὸ γὰρ υἱὸς τοῦτο] is a common name of all," &c. In the next chapter he wishes to make this argument still plainer, and says, "The name son [τὸ υἱὸς ὄνομα] belongs to men, and belongs also to Christ,.....therefore he first said 'the only-begotten' [ὁ Μονογενής], and then 'Son' [Υἱός]." Now this not only fixes the reading, but may satisfy us that Chrysostom knew no other reading; for had he known it, he would not have been justified in not mentioning it. No passage that will bear a moment's comparison with this has been adduced from any writer in favour of the reading Θεός [God]. Chrysostom

quotes the passage in its usual form (once with the variation *αὐτός*) in five other places; but it is needless to notice them in detail.*

We need not carry this inquiry further. We have now examined (so far as I am aware) all the evidence that can be seriously adduced in support of the reading Θεός [God], and exhibited the nature of the evidence on the other side. Those who wish for a larger stock of material on which to base their judgment, will find in Mr. Abbot's article numerous references to other (chiefly later) writers, who all confirm the reading Υἱός [Son] by express quotation, and give no indication of the other reading, further than is supplied by their use of the phrase "only-begotten God."

We must now briefly sum up. I went to this inquiry expecting, in reliance on the deservedly high authority of Dr. Tregelles, to find ample and satisfactory evidence that several of the early Christian writers regarded Θεός [God] as the genuine reading in John i. 18. The conviction now forced upon my mind (though perhaps few will follow me so far) is, that there is no sufficient evidence to shew that any writer in the early Church seriously regarded it in this light. My reasons are briefly these:—First, the room for doubt in all the passages where this verse is quoted with the reading Θεός. There is not one where any serious difficulty would be presented by the context, if Υἱός [Son] were substituted for Θεός [God]. In every instance, therefore (and the total number is not great), the reading may be due either to a faulty memory, or to the intentional adoption of words supposed to be equivalent in meaning to the Scripture words, or to an error of transcription. Secondly, the clearness and certainty of several of the quotations containing Υἱός [Son]. So clear and certain are these that if the manuscripts now contained the reading Θεός [God], the context would *prove them to be corrupt*. I, therefore, totally dissent from Dr. Tregelles's statement, "Ex his nonnulli *vere* legebant *θεος*" [some of these *really* read *θεος*]. The change in transcription, to the facility of which he refers, is as easy in one direction as the other; and if, as I admit,

---

* De incomp. Dei Naturâ, v. 1 [Migne, 736]. Ad eos qui scand. sunt, c. 3 [Migne, iii. 485]. Interp. in Isai. vi. 1 [Migne, vi. 68]. In illud, Filius ex se nihil facit, c. 6 [Migne, vi. 256]. In Joannem, Hom. xv. (al. xiv.) [Migne, viii. 97].

such a change has been sometimes made, evidence alone can determine in which direction. Thirdly, the improbability that the reading should not be appealed to in the Trinitarian controversy. This is a negative argument, but it is a strong one. There is a vast collection of literature upon this subject, and all sorts of texts that ingenious interpretation can turn into proofs of Christ's Deity are brought together; but not a solitary passage is adduced in which an argument is clearly based on the reading Θεός in John i. 18. This abstinence would be utterly inexplicable if the reading had been really known and regarded as genuine. Fourthly, the improbability that no reference should be made to the existence of two readings, if they were known to exist. Now we *know* that the reading Υἱός [Son] existed, that such writers as Eusebius, Athanasius and Chrysostom, treat it as unquestionably genuine, without calling attention to the existence of another reading. The universal and unbroken silence in regard to any uncertainty of text seems to prove that no alternative was known, and that Υἱός [Son] was the reading accepted without question by Christian antiquity.

IV. Lastly, a few words must be said as to the internal evidence. It is contended that transcribers would naturally put Υἱός [Son] after *μονογενής* [only-begotten]. This is quite true, and if Θεός [God] were the reading of the great majority of manuscripts, and Υἱός [Son] occurred only in five, it would be a sufficient explanation of the fact. But as the case is exactly the reverse of this, it seems inadequate. The fact that a reading is dogmatically remarkable is a reason, not for its change, but for its permanence, especially if it fall in, as in the present instance, with the general belief. One would as soon expect the first verse of John to be altered as this, if Θεός [God] were the original reading. But can the change of Υἱός [Son] into Θεός [God] be explained? Very easily; for just at the time when the principal manuscripts which exhibit the latter reading were written, ὁ Μονογενὴς Θεός [the only-begotten God] was one of the most familiar names for the Son, and was, as we have seen, supposed to represent a scriptural idea. It is, therefore, not surprising that the expression has crept into the manuscripts. The change is confined to the present verse, because this is the only one where it would not be obviously erroneous. Critical principles, then, do not require us to adopt Θεός [God] as the Lectio ardua; for pro-

bably, when it was first inserted in the manuscripts, it was the Lectio proclivis. Turning to the sense of the verse, we cannot but think the reading Θεός [God] wholly improbable. The word Θεόν has just preceded, without any qualifying word. If the reading "God" were correct, we should expect to have "no one has seen God in his essence," or "the unbegotten God," or simply "the Father." With this reading, then, the verse is harsh and ill-connected; but with the reading "Son," the harshness is removed and the connection is clear and good. Nor must we overlook the fact that "Only-begotten Son" is a Johannine expression, whereas "Only-begotten God" has no parallel. On the whole, the internal evidence seems against the reading "God."

To sum up our whole examination:—the evidence afforded by manuscripts preponderates against the reading Θεός [God]; that afforded by the Versions also preponderates against it; the testimony of the early Christian writers is (in my judgment) overwhelmingly against it; and the internal evidence is against it. We can, therefore, have no hesitation in rejecting it.

JAMES DRUMMOND.

III.—THE CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTIONS IN RELATION TO BIBLICAL HISTORY.

1. *Bampton Lectures*, Vol. LXXXII., 1859. *The Historical Evidences of the Truth of the Scripture Records, stated anew, with special reference to the Doubts and Difficulties of Modern Times.* By George Rawlinson, M.A., late Tutor and Fellow of Exeter College.
2. *The Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World.* By George Rawlinson, M.A., Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford. In 4 vols. 8vo. 1862-7.
3. *The Alleged Historical Difficulties of the Old and New Testaments. A Lecture delivered in connection with the Christian Evidence Society.* By the Rev. George Rawlinson, M.A. 1871.

THE decipherment and interpretation of the hieroglyphics of Egypt and the cuneiform inscriptions of Persia, Assyria

and Babylonia, are the two most remarkable events in the history of literature and science during the nineteenth century. At its commencement, hieroglyphics were given up to such wild conjectures as those of Kircher's Œdipus Ægyptiacus, or Count Palin, who read a version of the 100th Psalm in the inscription on the portico of Dendera. Professor Lichtenstein of Helmstadt, applying his imaginary alphabet to the cuneiform inscriptions on the Babylonian bricks, read some of them into passages resembling the Koran, and hence concluded that they were all of later origin than the time of Mahomet.

The history of hieroglyphical discovery, from the days of Young and Champollion, is familiar to the historical student; that of the cuneiform characters is less known, nor can its results up to the present time be stated with the same degree of confidence. The process was far more difficult. The Egyptologist worked upon a translated document; he had often a picture to guide him in fixing the meaning of a word; the ancient language of Egypt survived, though mutilated and disfigured, in the Coptic. None of these aids were possessed by those who attempted to unravel the mystery of the cuneiform* inscriptions. No ancient writer had left a hint of the principle on which the character had been constructed. With the exception of a few names of Babylonian kings and places, in which a Semitic element was discernible, there was no indication into what language an attempt to read it should be made. And this presumption seemed to be counterbalanced by the pedigree of Nimrod, "the beginning of whose kingdom was Babel" (Gen. x. 10), which makes him a grandson, not of Shem, but of Ham. No bilingual monument was at hand to guide or correct the decipherer and interpreter. It is not wonderful if the task seemed hopeless.

The first steady light came from the North. The comparison of the Babylonian, Assyrian and Persepolitan inscriptions, shews that in its progress upwards from the

---

* After being variously denominated *arrow-headed* and *nail-headed*, *cuneiform* (wedge-shaped) has been finally accepted as the designation of the Babylonian and Persepolitan character. The form of an arrow-head has been supposed to have originated in the use of arrows in divination. Ezek. xxi. 21: "The king of Babylon stood at the parting of the way to use divination; he made his arrows bright, he consulted with images, he looked in the liver."

region where it is first found, the cuneiform writing underwent a gradual progress of simplification, the essential element remaining the same. As seen on the bricks and engraved pebbles found in Lower Mesopotamia, it appears to have been still partly pictorial, or, if phonetic, syllabic, not alphabetical. As we advance northward to the proper Assyria, the country on the eastern bank of the Tigris, between the Greater and Lesser Zab, we find on the Nemroud and Khorsabad monuments a character from which the traces of a pictorial origin have nearly disappeared, and which is, for the most part, syllabic and alphabetical. And when we reach the ancient domain of the Achæmenidæ, Persia, Media, Bactriana, we find the same elementary form, but the character has become purely phonetic and alphabetical.* Here the key was found.

The inscriptions of Persepolis, which had been made known to European scholars by the works of Chardin, Le Bruyn and Kämpffer, were first accurately copied by the traveller Niebuhr, and having thus a sure foundation to build upon, they began to attempt their interpretation. If the progress was slow, it was sure. Tychsen of Rostock and Münter of Copenhagen led the way; they ascertained that the cuneiform characters were to be read from left to right; that the words were divided by an oblique character and the letters by a point; and they had thus gained a reasonable presumption that the character was alphabetical. Grotefend, Professor at Frankfurt, was able to produce in an Appendix to Heeren's "Ideen über die Politik und Handel der vornehmsten Völker der alten Welt," published in 1815, a connected rendering of several of the Persepolitan inscriptions.† In the sculptures on the walls of the palace, a majestic figure is seen, sitting, while others kneel and bow around him, or hold a sunshade over his head. There could be no doubt that this was a king, and it was a

---

* This last change was probably made when the Persians became masters of Assyria and Babylonia. A passage in the Epistles of Themistocles (No. xxi.) contrasts the old Assyrian letters with those recently introduced by Darius. Critics rank the Epistles of Themistocles with those of Phalaris; yet the sophist who indited them may have known an archæological fact which does not appear in history.

† His first paper on this subject was read before the Royal Society of Göttingen in 1802.

reasonable inference that the group of characters which appears above or beside him stood for *king*. This group was followed by another, differing from it only by an addition at the end, and this pointed to a modification of the preceding word. Judging from the analogy of oriental royal titles, "king of kings" was a probable explanation. But in what language was the phonetic equivalent of the group of characters to be sought? There could be little hesitation. Media and Bactriana were the original seat of the Zoroastrian or old Persian religion. Its sacred book or books, the Zendavesta, or "Living Word," had been brought in 1762 to Europe by M. Anquetil du Perron,* and he had published a grammar and lexicon of the language, which obtained the name of Zendic, from the collection of writings composed in it. He had created a prejudice against himself by the boastful tone in which he announced his discovery. Sir William Jones treated him with contempt, and intimated that he had been imposed upon by a recent forgery of the Guebres of Surat.† But a residence in India and the study of the Sanscrit convinced him of his mistake, and he subsequently acknowledged the high antiquity of the Zendic language, and even argued, from its affinity with the Sanscrit, that a colony had passed from Iran (Ariana),‡ in very early times, to India.§ Now in Zendic, *Kschcio* is *king* (perhaps the origin of *shah* in Persian), and the group which precedes it on the inscription begins with the same letter, which also occurs again near the end. This group being assumed to read *Ksch*, Grotefend sought among the Persian monarchs for one whose name twice included a letter of similar sound. There could be little hesitation in fixing upon Xerxes, which he read *Kschersche*, the final *s* being considered a Greek termination. This corresponded very well with the Hebrew spelling of the same monarch's name in the book of Esther, in which, dismissing the vowels and

---

* His labours have been completely superseded by M. Burnouf's edition of the Yaçna (Liturgy), 1835.

† Works of Sir W. Jones, Vol. X. p. 403.

‡ Why have modern ethnographers disguised the origin of the people, who make so great a figure in their volumes, by writing their name, Aryan? Surely there was little danger that, if they called them Arians, they should be confounded with the followers of the heretical presbyter of Alexandria.

§ Asiatic Researches, Vol. I. p. 187.

the prothetic *aleph*,* there remain only חשרש (Chshersh). The cruel and voluptuous character of Ahasuerus corresponds too accurately with that of Xerxes, though we may reasonably doubt some portions of the narrative in Esther.

The work of Grotefend was continued and perfected by other inquirers, Lassen and Westergaard, Oppert, Hincks and Sir H. Rawlinson. To the last-mentioned author we owe the transcript and translation of the great rock inscription of Behistun, which has cleared up an obscure passage in Herodotus, by recording the defeat of an insurrection of the Medes against Darius, of which no historian made any mention.† The result of all their labours has been that this class of the cuneiform inscriptions can be deciphered and interpreted with a high degree of certainty. We need only quote the testimony of Professor Max Müller to this effect—a man whom no one will accuse of blind credulity. He calls the whole process "a glorious siege and victory."‡ Of its results in relation to the Jewish history we shall have to speak in a later portion of this article.

The same eminent scholar pronounces a much more guarded opinion in respect to the Assyrian and Babylonian inscriptions, classing them with Egyptian hieroglyphics, as "waiting to have their riddle more satisfactorily read." The complexity of the characters, some containing a combination of not fewer than sixteen strokes, and the uncertainty what language they represented, seemed to render the riddle insoluble. Up to this time no bilingual monument has been discovered to confirm the conjectures of Assyriologists.§ Professor Rawlinson's account of the population whose language the oldest of the cuneiform monuments represent, shews what a wide and fertile field there was for the imagination. "It united," he says, "Cushite with Turanian

---

* So the *kschatrapa* (satrap) of the Persian becomes אשדרף *(aschdrap)* in Hebrew and Chaldee. In Ezra iv. 6, Ahasuerus is made successor to Darius, which Xerxes really was. The Ahasuerus of Tobit xiv. 15, who is made to join Nebuchadnezzar in the conquest of Nineveh, is altogether unhistorical.

† Egypt of Herodotus, p. 18. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Vol. X. p. 1.

‡ Lectures on the Science of Language, Second Series, p. 5.

§ The double inscription, in Phœnician and cuneiform, on some Assyrian standard weights, can hardly be reckoned in this class, as the one is not a translation of the other, beyond the word מנה, *maneh*, mina. See Madden's Jewish Coinage, p. 259.

blood, with moreover a slight Semitic and probably a slight Arian element."* Wonderful feats, indeed, have been accomplished by skilful decipherers. The late Dr. Edward Hincks was so great a master of this art that it was said no cipher could baffle him. But the decipherer works upon a known language, and if English does not furnish him with the key, he tries Latin, French, Italian, and so on. Of the four mentioned by Professor Rawlinson, the Semitic was the only one which afforded any tangible materials. We do not know what were the mental processes through which Sir Henry Rawlinson, M. Oppert, Mr. Fox Talbot and Dr. Hincks passed; how often they had to unweave the web which they had begun; perhaps they themselves could not reveal the history. But judging from the large proportion of the Semitic element which appears in their translations, we conclude that it was by its means they groped their way to the results which they have attained. All presumption was in its favour. The patriarch of the Jews had come from a Chaldæan district, and though the Assyrian language was unintelligible to the Jews in the days of Hezekiah (2 Kings xviii. 26), so would *Platt Deutsch* be to a descendant of the Saxons, in the 19th century, notwithstanding the original affinity of the two dialects.

Grotefend's discovery attracted hardly any attention in England. What came from Germany was little known, or if known little esteemed, in the beginning of this century. Towards the middle of it, however, a powerful impulse was given to Assyrian studies by the discoveries of Botta and Layard, which enriched the museums of Europe with a copious variety of monuments of Assyrian sculpture and writing. This accession of materials revived the hope, that by their aid the problem of the more complex cuneiform character might be solved. The four scholars whose names have been mentioned in the preceding paragraph had all been separately at work upon it; and one of them, Mr. H. Fox Talbot, proposed as a test, that they should prepare, independently of each other, a transcript and translation of a given inscription. He sent his own in a sealed packet to the Royal Asiatic Society; the three others did the same. Six gentlemen were appointed to examine and report upon

---

* Ancient Monarchies, III. 321.

them, of whom Dean Milman and Mr. Grote alone went through the whole examination and alone report the result; Sir Gardner Wilkinson making his remarks separately, which, however, are in substantial agreement with the report. The Dean and Mr. Grote certify "that the coincidences between the translations, both in the general sense and verbal rendering, are very remarkable. In most parts there was a strong correspondence in the meaning assigned, and occasionally a curious identity of expression as to particular words. Where the versions differed very materially, each translator had in many cases marked the passage, as one of doubtful or unascertained signification. In the interpretation of numbers, there was throughout a singular correspondence." There is also a remarkable concurrence in the reading of proper names. In one paragraph, thirty-nine names of countries occur, which Sir H. Rawlinson, Mr. Talbot and M. Oppert, render exactly in the same manner. As an appendix to the report, the translations of the same passage by different authors are given in parallel columns. The comparison justifies the cautious verdict of the judges, but it shews that a solid foundation had been laid, though here and there an unsound stone would have to be taken out. This was in 1857; since that time the study has been zealously pursued, especially by the brothers Rawlinson, the President of the Royal Geographical Society and the Camden Professor of Ancient History at Oxford. There appears to be a general *consensus* among historical students in accepting as *substantially* correct their interpretation of the cuneiform records. Even the merciless critic in the Edinburgh Review,* though he treats Professor Rawlinson's series of kings from Ismï-Dagon in 1861 B.C. as a house of cards, does not deny a certain amount of credibility to his readings and interpretations. The trustees of the British Museum have published several fasciculi of inscriptions, of which translations have been given and a dictionary formed by Mr. Norris. M. Oppert has published "Elemens de la Grammaire Assyrienne." The number of the separate characters has been ascertained, and types cast to represent them. These things could not have been accomplished, had the whole system been fancy-work.

* January, 1867. Also p. 154 in the volume for 1870.

We think, therefore, that the time is come when we may employ (with some reserve of course) the results of the labours of the eminent men whose names we have mentioned, as materials for history. We must profess our entire dependence on their authority as *experts*, having no knowledge of our own. And we propose to confine our illustrations to the Bible history, as alone suited to the special purpose of this Review. Professor Rawlinson's four volumes will afford the student of general history ample information of all that is known or believed. He has brought together the testimonies of the ancients on the subject of Assyrian and Babylonian history, confirming or correcting them by the cuneiform records, and illustrating manners and customs by excellent engravings from authentic monuments.

The first glimpse which we have in Scripture of the condition of the country in which the great Babylonian monarchy arose, is in the tenth chapter of the book of Genesis, where the beginning of Nimrod's kingdom is said to have been "Babel and Erech and Accad and Calneh in the land of Shinar." Of these four names, Erech (Warka) and Accad are found in inscriptions, and the expression Kiprat Arba (four tongues) is of frequent occurrence. But whether they were essentially distinct or only dialectic forms, we have no means of knowing. The account of Chedorlaomer's league in the time of Abraham, assumes that Shinar was then only one among several warlike states. It is evident that civilization advanced here, as elsewhere, by gradual steps. In the early tombs of Lower Mesopotamia, implements of stone and bronze only are found, iron not being used except for personal ornaments.* We must be content to admit a long, unascertained interval between the first peopling of this region and the commencement of tradition. Genealogies at variance with the established laws of human longevity no longer find a place in chronology. From the mention of Ham as the grandfather of Nimrod, the investigators of the cuneiform inscriptions were led into an unsuccessful search for a Hamite language to serve as a key, and it still occurs occasionally in Professor Rawlinson's speculations. But this genealogy is open to grave doubts. The nations said to be descended from Ham, the accursed

* Rawlinson, Five Monarchies, I. 120.

of his father, are precisely those against whom it was natural for the Jews to harbour the strongest national prejudices—the Egyptians, to whom they had been in bondage—the Canaanites, whom they had dispossessed of their land—the Philistines, who had humbled and oppressed them—the Babylonians, from whom they had so cruelly suffered. That the Jewish writers were not exempt from such a prejudice, in assigning the origin of their enemies, is evident from the odious genealogy of the Moabites and Ammonites in Gen. xix. 37, 38. In speaking freely of this tenth chapter, we may plead the example of the Camden Professor, who says (III. 158), "if it be the work of Moses," and even expresses a doubt (II. 303) whether it may not be the work of Ezra, being in this respect in wonderful accordance with one of the boldest of German rationalists, Von Bohlen, who thinks the whole legend of the Deluge to have been brought back from the Captivity. We shall require more substantial evidence than that given on the authority of Sir H. Rawlinson (Five Monarchies, I. 65), to establish the existence of an Ethiopian people in Southern Mesopotamia.* The Professor quotes also with approbation a work of M. Lenormant, who speaks of "the first Cushite empire" as commencing the history of the East.†

We must equally object to his own nomenclature, when he calls his first monarchy Chaldæan and Protochaldæan.‡ He himself acknowledges that the name has never been found in any cuneiform inscription earlier than the ninth century B.C., then only in *Assyrian* monuments, and as the name of the race dominant in the region about Babylon. He therefore, inconsistently as we think, prefers the late and confused accounts of Berosus, who makes Chaldæans to have reigned in Babylonia before and after the Deluge.§ The biblical accounts are in harmony with this late origin or diffusion of the Chaldæan name, as attested by the in-

---

* In his Lecture before the Christian Evidence Society (p. 10), Professor Rawlinson says that the analysis of the earliest Babylonian documents shews that their vocabulary presents numerous analogies with the non-Semitic languages of Ethiopia, but gives not a single reference in support of this assertion.

† The reader of the article in the Edinburgh Review, before referred to (p. 501), will demur to the title given by Professor Rawlinson to M. Lenormant, of "one of the best representatives of modern historical science."

‡ Vol. I. p. 70. § Cory's Ancient Fragments, p. 26.

scriptions.*' Professor Rawlinson quotes Gen. xi. 31, where Abram is said to come from "Ur of the Chaldees," as a proof of the early use of the name, adding a groundless hypothesis that Ur was in Lower Mesopotamia, not where biblical geographers have placed it, in agreement with the recorded stages of the journey of Terah and his descendants, in Northern Mesopotamia. Indeed, he has cut the ground from under his own feet, by admitting the uncertain age of this portion of the Pentateuch. Nothing can be inferred from the mention of the Chaldæans in the book of Job, the age of which has been variously assigned from the time of Moses to the captivity. It is only in the Hebrew prophets that we find a sure indication of the time when they first appeared as constituting a nation. In the oracle against Tyre (Isaiah xxiii. 13), we read: "Behold the land of the Chaldæans! This people was not; Assyria established it for the dwellers in the wilderness." (Comp. Ps. lxxii. 9.) "They are erecting their watch-towers; they are destroying their" (the Tyrian) "palaces; they are reducing them to ruins."† It was a special humiliation for Tyre that its siege, of which the prophet anticipates a triumphant result, should be carried on by a nation that had no place in past history. Isaiah prophesied about the middle of the eighth century B.C., and thus the Assyrian inscriptions harmonize perfectly with the indications of Scripture. It is true that in Isaiah xiii. 19, Babylon is called the "proud beauty of the Chaldæans," a description which could apply to them only as a dominant race, such as they ultimately became. But this is only one, among many traces in this chapter, of a much later age than that of Isaiah, probably the end of the Captivity. Professor Rawlinson (III. 445) quotes Isaiah xliii. 14, "The Chaldeans whose cry is to their ships," as a proof of their early navigation of the Persian Gulf. The rendering is not quite correct;‡ but the allusion to a

---

* The use of the name Chaldæan for astrologer and interpreter of dreams in Daniel (iv. 7, &c.), is one of the many traces of a late origin. In the genuine works of the Hebrew prophets it always denotes the nation, not a caste.

† See Gesenius ad loc. Ewald, who understands כנען, in v. 11, of Canaan, not, as the English version, "merchant city," substitutes conjecturally, in v. 13, "Canaanites" for "Chaldæans."

‡ "For your sake I have sent to Babylon, and have made all her fugitives and the Chaldeans go down to the ships wherein they rejoiced." Revised Translation.

naval power is an additional reason for referring this portion of Isaiah also to the age of the Captivity. We cannot, however, expect Professor Rawlinson to acquiesce in these criticisms, since to him everything that is included in "The Book of the Prophet Isaiah" is of one author and one age.

The cylinder on which the experiment of the independent translations was made, purports to record the deeds of Tiglath Pileser, who is considered to be the first of the name and to have lived twelve centuries B.C.* Whatever its age, it has no bearing on Scripture history; nor till we reach the ninth century B.C. has any monument yet come to light, from which an illustration of that history can be derived. Assyria proper appears to have been warlike and aggressive, but had not come into conflict with Israel or Judah. Its tendency, however, was westward, and it was not long before Judæa felt its power. The visitors to the Assyrian Hall of the British Museum must have noticed the magnificent obelisk of black marble which is one of its most precious treasures. Its discovery at Nemroud and its transport to England are due to the activity and intelligence of Mr. Layard. It evidently records homage paid and tribute brought to a sovereign, who is seen in the two uppermost of the five bands of sculpture which occupy the four faces of the obelisk. Over each band is an epigraph in cuneiform characters, and in the second of these epigraphs Sir H. Rawlinson and Dr. Hincks independently discovered the name of Jehu Bit Omri, mentioned as giving tribute to Shalmaneser II., by whom the obelisk was erected.† The following is the statement of the articles presented by Jehu: "Tribute of Jehu, son of Omri, silver, gold, a bowl of gold, drinking cups of gold, vessels of gold, buckets (?) of gold, lead, rods of wood, royal furniture and maces I received." The articles brought as tribute in the sculpture to which the epigraph refers correspond very well with this enumeration; the physiognomy of the tribute-bearers appears

---

* Dr. Hincks, Trans. of Asiatic Society, xviii. 54. Rawlinson, who calls him Tiglathinin I., makes him begin his reign 1270 B.C., III. p. 292.

† This and the following translation is given on the authority of Mr. G. Smith, the able assistant of Dr. Birch in the Assyrian department of the British Museum. Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature, Vol. IX. N.S.

to be more decidedly Jewish in Professor Rawlinson's woodcut (II. 365) than in the original, but may be taken as Syrian. Besides Jehu, the name of Hazael of Damascus occurs on the obelisk. Shalmaneser relates that "in his eighteenth year he crossed the Euphrates, and Hazael of Syria came out to meet him; he captured 1121 of his chariots and his camp, took four of his fortified cities, and received tribute from Tyre, Zidon and Gebal." So far the obelisk. In inscriptions on the winged bulls and slabs from Nemroud, he relates further victories or gives fuller details of the same campaign; he slew 16,000 of Hazael's men of war, and pursued him to his capital Damascus. It has been supposed that the name of Benhadad may also be read on a monument of Shalmaneser; but the reading is doubtful.

We are not concerned to maintain the accuracy of these one-sided histories; though, if Jabin could muster nine hundred chariots (Judges iv. 3), we see no reason why Hazael should not bring eleven hundred into the field. The power of the kingdom of Damascus was at its height. Hazael's predecessor Benhadad, whose throne he had usurped, had been sufficiently powerful to invest Samaria, and would have reduced it by famine, had not panic broken up his army (2 Kings vi. 24, vii. 6). Hazael had possessed himself of all the territory beyond Jordan, during the latter part of the reign of Jehu (2 Kings x. 32). In the seventh year of Jehu, Jehoash, king of Juda, had been compelled to sacrifice all the sacred furniture and treasures of the Temple and the palace, to prevent Hazael from occupying Jerusalem (2 Kings xii. 17; 2 Chron. xxiv. 23). During the reign of Jehoahaz, the successor of Jehu, Samaria had been so humbled by Hazael, that he allowed him to retain only ten chariots, fifty horsemen and 10,000 infantry. The sudden recovery of the power of Israel during the reign of Jehoash, who retook from Benhadad, the successor of Hazael, all the cities which Jehoahaz had lost, which is not explained in the Jewish history (2 Kings xiii. 25), may be reasonably attributed to the weakening effect of Shalmaneser's invasions on the kingdom of Damascus, as recorded on the obelisk. We must be satisfied with this general coincidence, nor have we a right to call in question either the correctness of the translation, or the fact of the

payment of tribute by Jehu, because no mention is made of it in the book of Kings or Chronicles. Jewish historians were "men of like feelings with ourselves," and did not consider it matter of conscience to record every humiliation of their country. Their "philosophy of history" was, to shew the constant connection of national glory with the observance or neglect of the worship of Jehovah. Jehu had been the exterminator of the priests of Baal.

These repeated expeditions of the Assyrian monarchs into Syria and Palestine did not lead in the ninth century B.C. to any permanent conquest. But in the next century, when their empire was consolidated, they desired to put down every independent power between them and the Mediterranean. The first name of an Assyrian sovereign in the Jewish annals is Pul, who, in 2 Kings xv. 19, is said to have invaded Israel in the reign of Menahem (771 B.C.) and exacted from him 1000 talents of silver. Here the inscriptions entirely fail us; not only no king of that name appears in them at this or any other period, but they shew the Assyrian monarchy at that time to have been in a state of weakness and division which precludes the idea of a foreign conquest. Professor Rawlinson admits the difficulty,* and can only suggest that Pul may have been a Babylonian king, inaccurately called an Assyrian, as Ezra (vi. 22) calls Darius Hystaspis.† But then the Babylonian monuments know no Pul any more than the Assyrian. Too much stress must not be laid on merely negative evidence. The most captious critic would hardly suspect the Jewish annalists of having invented the story of a king of Israel paying tribute to a foreigner in order to enforce the lesson that calamity was the sure consequence of idolatry. The Assyrian monuments, however, describe Tiglath Pileser as taking tribute from Menahem, and there may have been a confusion of dates; a confusion of names is hardly supposable.‡ Ahaz made himself tributary to Tiglath Pileser, in order to be avenged of the king of Damascus. An inscription of Tiglath Pileser records his reception of tribute from a

---

* Alleged Historical Difficulties of the Old and New Testament, p. 23.

† Polyhistor (Cory, p. 61) mentions Phulus as a Chaldæan king who invaded Judæa. Hence probably the confusion, which need not embarrass any one who does not maintain the inspiration and consequent infallibility of Jewish history.

‡ Rawlinson, II. 388, note.

king of Judah, whom he calls *Yahu-Khazi*, which may perhaps be identified with Ahaz.* We derive no information from the inscriptions, respecting the invasion of Israel, the capture of Samaria, and the deportation of the people by Shalmaneser (the fourth and last of that name), as related in 2 Kings, ch. xvii. His successor, Sargon, had been known, previously to the interpretation of the cuneiform inscriptions, only by the mention of him in Isaiah xx. 1, as sending his general Tartan to besiege Azotus. Of his reign the memorials furnished by the inscriptions are so copious, that M. Oppert has been enabled to construct "Annales des Sargonides," and Professor Rawlinson to write a connected history of it. They have no particular bearing on the Bible history, but accord well with it. Ashdod, which the general of Sargon was besieging, was the key of Egypt, and a place of such strength that Psammeticus besieged it for twenty-nine years.† Evidently, Sargon meditated an attack on Egypt, which sought to strengthen itself by an alliance with the Jews. Their prophets were sagacious in reading the aspect of the political horizon; they foresaw that Egypt would succumb in a contest with Assyria, and warned their countrymen against the danger of an alliance with her.‡ The annals of Sargon relate that in a great battle on the frontier of Egypt, he totally defeated the Egyptians. Warned by the prophet, Judah escaped the punishment which the alliance with Egypt had brought upon Israel.

In the reign of Sennacherib, the son and successor of Sargon, the Assyrian inscriptions and the biblical records again run parallel, and afford a very instructive comparison. Here, too, Greek history may be confronted with both. We possess two cylinders, which, as interpreted by Mr. Fox Talbot and M. Oppert, give us a connected view of several years of his reign. We turn with deep interest to the narrative of his expedition against Jerusalem. The second book of Kings (xviii. xix.) gives no explanation of the offence which Hezekiah acknowledges (v. 14) that he had committed against the king of Assyria; the cylinder ex-

---

* Rawlinson, II. 399, note.

† Herod. ii. 159.

‡ Isaiah xx. xxi. This leaning towards an alliance with Egypt had already been fatal to the kingdom of Israel, Shalmaneser having taken Samaria and carried away the inhabitants. 2 Kings xvii. 3—6.

plains it; he had harboured the deposed king of Ekron, the enemy of Assyria. The act seemed trifling, but it indicated a hostile policy. While he was yet at Lachish, Hezekiah offered unconditional submission, and the terms imposed on him were, that he should pay 300 talents of silver and 30 talents of gold, which Hezekiah obtained by stripping off the gold from the doors and pillars of the Temple. We give below a summary of the narrative of Sennacherib,* which so nearly agrees with that of the Bible, that if we remember how much one side would be tempted to extenuate its loss, and the other to exaggerate its victory, we need not charge either with falsehood. But to this history succeeds immediately, in v. 17, a narrative of the haughty message sent from the same Lachish to Hezekiah, the tone of which indicates that, instead of having recently made humble submission, Hezekiah was maintaining an attitude of defiance towards Assyria. The book of Kings gives us no hint of the time which elapsed between the first and second expedition; and as the Assyrian annals give no account of the second, we have no means of judging what could have occurred to change so entirely the tone of Hezekiah. The two accounts in the Kings cannot refer to the same event; nor is the absence of any mention of the humiliating result of the first in the Chronicles (2 Chron. xxix. xxxii.) any proof of its non-occurrence. It does, however, appear from the Chronicles, that between the first and the second expedition Hezekiah had prepared himself to stand a siege by cutting off the supply of water and repairing the walls. The narrative of the destruction of Sennacherib's army is familiar to every reader of the Bible. It was an event interesting alike to Jewish and Egyptian patriotism, and the annals of each country preserved a tradition of it, both ascribing it to a Divine interposition.†

The annals of succeeding Assyrian princes to the fall of

---

* He says, "Because Hezekiah, king of Judah, would not submit to my yoke, I came up against him and took forty-six of his fenced cities, and carried off 200,150 people. And Hezekiah himself I shut up in Jerusalem, like a bird in a cage, building towers round about the city to hem him in. Then fear of my power fell upon Hezekiah, and he sent out the chiefs and elders of Jerusalem, with thirty talents of gold and eight hundred talents of silver and divers treasures." Rawlinson, Vol. II. p. 435.

† See Herod. ii. 141.

Nineveh afford no illustrations of biblical history. But the researches of Mr. Loftus and others among the remains of Babylonian buildings have furnished many inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar, shewing the extent and magnificence of his works. If, in Daniel (iv. 30), "The king spake and said, Is not this the great Babylon that I have built for the house of the kingdom by the might of my power and for the honour of my power and for the honour of my majesty," we have not an exact transcript of his words, we have a good representation of the tone of self-satisfaction in which he speaks of his public works in the annals of his reign. It must be admitted that his enumeration of them shews a vigilant care for the public health and comfort.* Altogether these annals leave a very different impression of his character from that which has come down to us through the hostile channel of Jewish writers. That they contain no record of the humiliating madness which fell upon him according to the book of Daniel, is no more than might have been expected; and nothing can be fairly inferred from it to the disadvantage of the Jewish writer, though the circumstances under which it occurred have evidently been devised according to the Jewish idea of the Nemesis of human pride and impiety. Comp. Acts xii. 22.

Of the many objections which criticism has raised against the genuineness of the book of Daniel, only one has been removed by the discovery of the Babylonian inscriptions. No Belshazzar had been found in the list of the kings of Babylon; but it appears that the last king, the Nabonnadus of Josephus, the Labynetus of Herodotus, had a son, Belsharezer, who was associated with him in the government. And even to make this discovery available, we must suppose that when Daniel calls Nebuchadnezzar (v. 11) the father of Belshazzar, he only meant an ancestor by the mother's side.† Of "Darius the Mede" (Dan. v. 31) no trace has been found, and Professor Rawlinson can only conjecture that he may have been Astyages, whom Cyrus deposed, but treated kindly,‡ or some Median noble. We need not

---

* Rawlinson, Vol. III. Reservoirs and canals, embankments, a town and quays on the Persian Gulf, are mentioned among his works, along with the walls of Babylon and the construction or repair of innumerable temples.

† Rawlinson, Lecture, p. 31.

‡ Herodotus, however, i. 269, says that Cyrus kept him at his court during the rest of his life.

point out how gratuitous and improbable these assumptions are. After all, it is not by discrepancies or inaccuracies like these that the question of the genuineness of the book of Daniel will be decided, but on a ground on which an independent historical critic and an Oxford Professor cannot possibly meet. The minute anticipation of future events, which to the one is a proof of the writer's inspiration, is to the other the sure mark of invention, by one who lived in a later age. It is not difficult to predict which view is likely to predominate in the future; and it may come to be acknowledged, even in a Bampton Lecture, that there is but one rule of evidence, one standard of credibility, for Jewish and Heathen history.

The cuneiform inscriptions of the Persian times have no direct bearing on biblical history, but tend indirectly to confirm it. Between the Jews and the Babylonians there existed not only national hostility, but religious hatred—the antagonism between monotheism and idolatry. The Persian royal inscriptions, of which Lassen has translated several,* are purely monotheistic, ascribing the creation of heaven and earth, man and his fortunes, to the sole god, Auromasdes. There is no trace in them of the worship or use of images, or even of the worship of the heavenly bodies, though in this respect they were corrupted by their conquest of Babylon. Cyrus would naturally sympathize with the monotheism of the Jews. He and his successors kept their eyes steadily fixed on the westward extension of their empire, and it was of the utmost importance to have a friendly nation established in a place so strong by nature and art as Jerusalem. If, in the decress of Cyrus, Darius and Artaxerxes, as given by Ezra and Nehemiah, we have not the precise words of the Persian monarchs, they represent the policy which that court steadily pursued. But whether dictated by sympathy or political foresight, the permission to the Jews to return to their native land was a most important event. Without it a link would have been missing in that wonderful chain which connects the origin of this people with the religious destinies of the world.

K.

‡ Die Keilinschriften, p. 85, &c.

IV.—GODET ON THE SYNOPTICAL GOSPELS.

Commentaire sur l'Evangile de Saint Luc. Par F. Godet, Docteur et Professeur en Théologie. 2 vols. Neuchatel. 1871.

THE kind of commentary which any writer composes on books of the Bible, depends greatly on his notion of the purpose for which it should be used by his readers. He may aim simply at explaining difficulties and supplying information, so as to render the meaning of the original clear, and to enable the student to see its full force. Or he may have a dogmatic purpose, and seek especially to educe from the Scripture commented on confirmation for his own favourite opinions. To this he may add a didactic aim, and take every opportunity of pointing to the lessons and enlarging on the moral and religious exhortations of each successive passage. The work of Dr. Godet, intended rather for the scholar and the theologian than for the general reader, offers very full explanations of the text, but has in it little that is purely didactic. Its dogmatic aim is to make the authenticity of the third Gospel certain, and to afford an antidote to rationalism in regard to the question of miracles. Naturalistic explanations and theories are constantly referred to, in order that they may be refuted. The extensive reading and scholarship of the author are everywhere manifest; the argumentative portions are clear and to the point, and even where they do not convince, give the impression that a skilful advocate has made the best of the case. The desire to reconcile all the statements of the evangelist leads to what seems to me undue attention to verbal questions, and to a stress in some passages on minutiæ of language which is at variance with the wider views elsewhere expressed.

A few examples may serve to convey an idea of the general tone of the work. Commenting on the temptation of Jesus, the author examines, in order to disprove, the theories—that the narrative in the Gospel is literally true; that it is a parable; that it is a myth; that it is the description of a moral struggle purely within the soul of Jesus; and then states his own view thus:

"As there is a mutual contact of bodies, so there is, in a sphere above the material, a mutual action and reaction of spirits. Into this higher sphere Jesus found himself raised, as the representative of free dependence on God and filial love of Him; and here he met the spirit that represents most energetically the self-will of the creature, and, spite of all its tricks and under every form, affirmed with freedom and conscience his own principles [son propre principe]. . . . But we need not suppose that Jesus was physically transported by Satan through the air. A spectator might have seen him during the temptation, motionless on the soil of the desert. The struggle did not emerge from the spiritual sphere, but it was none the less real." *

When the passage relating to the cure of a demoniac comes under notice, we find the following remarks:

"May there not have been, in the history of humanity, periods when God has permitted, if we may say so, the invasion of a superior malignant power? . . . . As God sent Jesus at the moment of history at which moral and social evil had reached its culminating point, did He not also permit at this same period this extraordinary manifestation of diabolic power, in order that Jesus might be pointed out, even visibly, as the conqueror of the enemy of mankind, the destroyer of the works of the devil, in a moral sense? . . . Possession is the caricature of Inspiration. The latter displaying its influence in conformity with man's moral nature, gives him possession of himself; the former, deeply hostile to the liberty of him who is affected by it, plunges him into a state of sickly passiveness and tends to the destruction of his personality. The one is the *chef-d'œuvre* of God, the other of the devil." †

The commentary on the resurrection thus concludes:

"This event did not take place merely to exalt the Saviour; it is itself salvation; it is condemnation removed, death conquered. We were condemned, Jesus died; as soon as his death had saved us, he lived again, and we live again in him. Such an event is everything, includes everything, or it is nothing." ‡

The value attached to the third Gospel by this commentator is very great. He says it far surpasses the others in quantity, and may at the same time be thoroughly depended upon for fidelity and exactitude. In these respects it is superior to the other Synoptics, both as to the words and to the works of Jesus; not less may it be depended

* I. 220. † I. 245, 246. ‡ II. 437.

on in regard to chronology and the sequence of events. These great claims are not put forward rashly. The introductory and concluding essays, including chapters on the three Synoptical Gospels, as well as on the character, time of composition and author of the third, shew that the whole subject has been very carefully studied. They are at once instructive and interesting, and encourage a more detailed notice of the subject to which they refer.

The theory of verbal inspiration, the "every-word, every-syllable, every-letter" theory, so savagely handled by Bishop Colenso, no longer finds support with writers who have any pretension to scholarship. Yet there is still a wide divergence of view among biblical critics. On the extreme right (to use political terms) are those who speak of the Gospels as simply and solely the work of the men whose names they bear. These critics will accept all the help modern research and learning can give, in determining the correct text, will expunge passages which are proved by the authority of the best MSS. to be unauthentic; but for the text thus arrived at they claim the authority of apostles and apostolic men; and they consider that the Gospels were written with a simple biographical aim, and merely intended to convey and preserve an exact knowledge of the words and deeds of the Founder of Christianity. At the opposite extreme are the critics who deny that Matthew, Mark and Luke had anything to do, directly or indirectly, with the works that bear their names, and assert that these writings were produced in the second century, with a purely dogmatic purpose, their several authors designing, under the guise of narratives, in which they worked up traditions concerning Jesus current in the church, to support and establish their own peculiar views of the nature and teaching of the Gospel, the first representing the position of the Hebrew Christians, the second a compromise between them and the Gentile converts, such as Peter is supposed to have favoured, and the third the Pauline teaching. Between these extremes there is a vast variety of theories. Dr. Godet enumerates many of them in his introduction, and endeavours to give a bird's-eye view of their conclusions by a table, including first, the writers of the Tübingen school, and secondly, independent writers. His own view may be briefly stated as follows.

In the first place, he adopts the conclusion of Reuss, which was elaborated by Réville, that the substance of our first canonical Gospel is a collection of *discourses* of Jesus, written by Matthew.

"We have no doubt whatever that there existed a collection of discourses written by the apostle Matthew which was one of the oldest Gospel writings. Our conviction on this point is founded not so much on the testimony of Papias, . . . as on the peculiar character of our first Gospel, in which we find great bodies of discourses, among the narrative portions, which certainly existed *in the form of discourses* before the narrative itself. The impression is unavoidable that these bodies of discourses really formed a whole." *

Dr. Godet next proceeds to shew his reasons for dissenting from the view of Holzmann, that the great groups of discourses of the first Gospel were formed by the writer gathering together, according to his own judgment, teachings of Jesus spoken at various times, and that he founded them on passages of our third Gospel; as well as from that of Weizsäcker, that the discourses in the first Gospel are the originals from which the passages similar to them in the third Gospel have been borrowed. His final conclusion is, "The work of the *logia* existed and is contained in our first Gospel; but it is not from this that Luke has drawn the teachings of the Lord; and hence we are brought to the declaration of Luke himself (Luke i. 1—4), which shews that among the writings that preceded his he found none that was the work of an apostle." †

There next comes under review the theory, that there was a common source of the narrative portion of the Synoptics, usually spoken of as the "Proto-Mark." The existence of this is denied for the following reasons: 1. Eusebius applied the testimony of Papias to our canonical Mark and to nothing else. 2. Had such a work existed, Luke would have particularized it in his proem, instead of including all writings then existing as inferior to the one he was about to produce. 3. The peculiar differences and resemblances of the Synoptical Gospels are not in harmony with the theory that their narratives are derived from a single common source. 4. The decisive argument is drawn from the

---

* II. 522. † II. 525.

style of the three writings. In the words of Weiss, "A composition so harmonious and vigorous as our first Gospel cannot be made up of selections from another writing." The first Gospel is written in good Greek; the third, in Hebraistic Greek: can they both be drawn from an intermediate text? Finally, the theory of Weiss is considered and combated—that the original Gospel of Matthew contained not only discourses, but also narratives, and that this was the foundation of the three Synoptics, the narrative being completed by Mark.

Having thus cleared the ground, by an attempt to get rid of the notion of any common *written* original, Dr. Godet endeavours to replace it by a description of the "teachings of the apostles," that is, "not a continual repetition of those two great facts of the death and resurrection which Peter proclaimed on the day of Pentecost, but the recital of the particular facts of the ministry of Jesus, and, above all, the reproduction of the teachings of the Master." "One day it would be the Sermon on the Mount, another a discourse on the mutual relations of the faithful (Matt. xviii.), a third day the eschatology. Recital was followed by comment. Except John, the twelve probably never went beyond this elementary sphere of Christian teaching."* The manner in which these oral teachings gradually crystallized into fixed forms is traced at great length; and it is urged that more liberty would be exercised in changing the phraseology with regard to the narrative portions, than with regard to the words of Jesus, which corresponds with the facts of the case in our existing Gospels. The rapid growth of a fixity of form in the traditions was favoured by the poverty of the Aramean language. When it became necessary to reproduce this apostolic teaching in Greek, those of the apostles who understood that language must have been employed on the task; and as certain expressions would present peculiar difficulties, the words once selected for them would necessarily be afterwards retained, as *ἐπιούσιος* and *πτερύγιον*. The passage from the oral Gospel to a written one would be through the production at first of detached teachings in manuscript, some in Aramean, some in Greek, some at Antioch, some at Jerusalem, some in other places.

---

* II. 529.

Such collections, more or less complete, are referred to by Luke in his proem. Matthew (A.D. 60—64) wrote in Aramean a collection of the great discourses of Jesus that had been preserved in the manner above stated. The narrative portion of our first Gospel was afterwards added, and was written in the first instance in Greek, by the same hand which translated the discourses into that language. It is probably the work of one of Matthew's disciples, and founded on that apostle's oral teaching. Mark, without any acquaintance with the work of Matthew, wrote his Gospel (A.D. 64), deriving his facts principally from the teachings of Peter. Both these Gospels reproduce the primitive tradition, whence their resemblance; each of them allows to predominate that element in which the apostle whence it emanated excelled, hence their differences. About the same time Luke composed his history in Greek, not having seen the writings of Matthew and Mark, but making use of the various fragmentary documents that were in existence; these were principally in Aramean.

I have stated in full the above theory as to the origin of the Synoptical Gospels, because it seems very fairly to represent the most conservative view that can be held by one who has a familiar acquaintance with modern criticism and a candid appreciation of its results. Several points in it offer a temptation to discussion. Allowing the probability of the formation of an oral Gospel as described above, and of the growth from it of many detached written records of single acts and discourses of Jesus, this does not remove the necessity for believing in some connected narrative, earlier than the canonical Gospels, such as that to which the name Proto-Mark has been given. The weak point in Godet's argument is the attempt to disprove the existence of this. His reasons against it amount at best only to difficulties in the way of believing in its existence, and admit of explanations which go far to remove them, while not one of them is positive and conclusive. On the other hand, the fact that when we take from the first Gospel the introductory chapters and the great discourses, what remains is nearly identical with the second Gospel, remains unexplained by Godet's theory. For if the sole foundation of the three Synoptics was a number of detached narratives (either oral or written), how can we account for the fact that the

first and second so often choose the same and omit the same, that both contain passages not found in the third, and both omit passages which that Gospel has? How, again, can we explain the agreement between the first two Gospels in the quotations from the Old Testament, when they are not quoted with verbal exactness from either the Hebrew or the Septuagint? These peculiarities seem to point to the existence of a common original of a different kind from detached traditions. The extent to which this was used in the formation of the third Gospel is a further question; but it is difficult to believe that evident traces of it may not be found there also; and whether we call it Proto-Mark, or give it any other name, the narratives cannot be accounted for without it. The difficulty is increased, if we are to suppose the narration of events in the first Gospel to have been derived from the *oral* teachings of Matthew in Palestine, and that of the second Gospel from the *oral* teachings of Peter at Rome. Their resemblance, in many instances their absolute verbal uniformity, is marvellous on such a supposition; and when are added to this passages in the third Gospel corresponding with the other two, and we are asked to believe that this third narrative was also based on traditions, and composed by one who had no acquaintance with the other two, or with the documents from which they were derived, assent becomes impossible.

Another peculiarity of the author with which I cannot sympathize, is his unwillingness to allow that the writer of any one of the Gospels was anything more than a biographer, in the strict sense of that word. He is indignant with the notion, that "the author of a historical writing, like our canonical Matthew, would permit himself to gather together into certain great masses words spoken in different circumstances, in order to form some so-called discourses."* Yet how, on any other supposition, can we account for the appearance, in the connected discourses of the first Gospel, of verses scattered up and down in various portions of the third? Dr. Godet seems, indeed, elsewhere to admit what in the above passage he denies, for he says the "Sermon on the Mount" in Matthew contains many words not originally belonging to it, and which Luke has rightly omitted, giving them, in other parts of his writing,

* II. 524.

a place more suitable and historically more exact.* He says, again, it is inconceivable that Luke should have picked out certain portions of the *Logia* and invented historical circumstances to connect them; but it is not inconceivable that Matthew should have united teachings which previously existed in a fragmentary form, in order to make connected discourses. The character of the "discourses" in the first Gospel, their systematic form and the order of their topics, the occurrence of portions of them in the other Gospels, all point to the supposition that Matthew, from previously existing detached documents and personal recollections, wrote the *Logia*, with the intention of conveying by means of them a correct notion of the teachings of Jesus, but not binding himself to any chronological order as to the period of delivery of the several precepts, or hesitating to combine into a connected discourse precepts that were uttered at different times and in different places. With less certainty, but at least as highly probable, I would venture to add that Mark wrote a sketch of the life and teachings of Jesus on the foundation of the lessons he received from Peter, and that our first canonical Gospel is formed by the union of these two, the translator into Greek of the Aramean *Logia* of Matthew making free use of the narrative of Mark, and adding some other traditions and a few original remarks and explanations of his own. The great difficulty that meets this view is found in the style of the first Gospel, which is that of an original writer rather than of a mere compiler. I feel this difficulty, but it is not insuperable; it is at least possible that the author might give to his materials and his translation such a unity as we find in the first canonical Gospel.

In the second canonical Gospel we may have a recension of the original of Mark by a later hand. The amplifications and graphic phrases which are characteristic of this Gospel may have been thrown in by this writer; but it seems more reasonable to suppose they are for the most part in the original, and that their absence in the first Gospel arises from the fact that the narrative was in it re-written by one who infused his own style into the whole of it. The second Gospel comes nearest, as I believe, of any that we possess, to the earliest connected history of Jesus that ever existed.

---

* I. 337.

With regard to the third Gospel, Dr. Godet says:

"First, we have proved a source purely Jewish, the genealogical document, iii. 23, et seq. Second, from i. 5 to end of ii., we find a recital completely Judæo-Christian. . . . Luke has preserved in Greek as faithfully as possible the Aramean character. . . . The other parts of the Gospel nearly all emanated from the Judæo-Christian Church. . . . Third, the parts in which this Hebraistic character is less apparent both in matter and manner have probably been translated into Greek from traditions public or private. Thus the account of the passion, in which we meet with classic forms, may be the work of Luke himself, or may be taken from some earlier Gospels and translated into Greek. Fourth, the account of the institution of the Lord's Supper may be derived from a Pauline source." *

He considers that the attempt to separate this Gospel accurately and exactly into its separate documents has been found futile; but he seems not to object to Luke being viewed as simply a compiler. This being the case, it is strange that he attributes such a high value as to accuracy and exactness to this work, taking its statements in preference to those of the other Gospels whenever they differ. Both in the third Gospel and in the closely connected writing the Acts, there are very plain marks of different documents being used, and the manner in which they are united seems to point to a later date than A.D. 65, and to a purpose that may be called dogmatic, namely, an aim to reconcile and unite antagonistic tendencies in the early Christian Church.

These Synoptical Gospels present so difficult a problem, that it is more easy to pull to pieces any solution that is offered than to supply a better one. Whatever I have said as to points on which Dr. Godet's statements are unsatisfactory, is quite consistent with an appreciation of the value of his scholarship and a recognition of the information to be obtained from his commentary. Especially useful is the description he gives of the growth of Christian tradition and the production of detached portions of Gospel history. If he does not clear away every difficulty, there is reason enough to thank him, if he sheds even a few rays of light on topics that are as important as they are obscure.

JOHN WRIGHT.

---

* II. 517.

V.—ARNOLD ON ST. PAUL.

St. Paul and Protestantism; with an Essay on Puritanism and the Church of England. By Matthew Arnold, D.C.L., LL.D. Second Edition. London. 1870.

Mr. Arnold's book has had many reviewers, but these have for the most part confined themselves, not unnaturally, almost wholly to the question between Church and Dissent which the book raises. For it is on the face of it controversial and aggressive, trailing across the path of those who are on the true scent after what of permanent value is in its pages, a more alluring but altogether less worthy and useful object of pursuit. We do not pretend to be quite indifferent to the many points raised between Conformists and Nonconformists, but they are as nothing in comparison with the graver and more enduring interest involved in the thesis of Mr. Arnold, which, indeed, is no less than this, that fundamental change in the tenets now called essential by popular theology appears not only compatible with Christianity and the life of the Church, but absolutely indispensable to the due development of both of them.

What Dr. Newman said of Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon, that he discharged his olive-branch as from a catapult, would be still more true of Mr. Arnold, if that engine of war were not far too rough for comparison with Mr. Arnold's style. But it may be averred that he deals with his adversaries as Isaac Walton with his worms, and though he loves them, yet has impaled them. This is not a mode of treatment as mentally as it is physically convincing; and a sort of undefined dread that themselves may be the next victims, unless they can succeed in putting Mr. Arnold down, has made many abandon the true subject of the book—St. Paul's theology—and rush, miscalculating their strength, to defend the positions of those who are accused of "a spirit of irritable injustice," of "mere blatancy and truculent hardness," of holding "spurious and degenerated sub-forms of Hebraism" tending to "degenerate into forms lower yet." We grin approvingly, or wriggle with uneasiness, accordingly as we feel in us a freedom from or consciousness of Philistinism, a belief or disbelief that "*nostra* res

agitur." Now, however, that the wounds of those whom Mr. Arnold's glittering steel has gashed are, we may hope, healing; now that they are perhaps finding them even salutary, it may be permitted us to disregard wholly the extraneous part of this book, and examine only St. Paul and his theology, as well as the present theology of the Christian Church, so far as it is founded on his teaching, and endeavour in some degree to forecast the influence upon the world's thought which the great Apostle of the Gentiles yet may have.

Mr. Arnold has by no means gone over all the ground which would be necessary for a complete survey of the apostle's life and works. He has confined himself to a few salient points—to those, in fact, on which theology has mainly fixed itself. We shall do the same, though touching perhaps lightly on some few matters which are not in Mr. Arnold's scheme; and we wish this paper, should it seem inadequate, to be considered as in a measure supplementary to those which have already appeared in these pages as reviews of M. Renan's volumes, "Les Apôtres" and "Saint Paul." And absolutely agreeing not only with the words, but with the whole intent and spirit, of the following sentence, "our greatest care is neither for the Church, nor for Puritanism, but for human perfection,"* we will endeavour to see whether, and how far, we can follow Mr. Arnold's interpretation of St. Paul, St. Paul's interpretation of Christianity, and how far an acceptance or rejection of the one or the other may tend toward the realization of that with which alone we are concerned.

But it must not be forgotten at the outset, that if the value of this little treatise, when stripped of its merely polemical adornments, will depend on how far it adequately represents the theological side of St. Paul, it does not follow that this same test of value may be pushed further back, and the value of St. Paul be made to depend wholly on the Christ whom his writings present to us, and the value of Christ's life wholly in his revelation of God. For if there be one thing more certain than another in the tendencies of our time, in that Zeit-Geist, on the influence of which Mr. Arnold so forcibly insists, it is that the idea of

---

* P. xxxiii.

God which was present to the mind of Paul, to name no Other, is very distinctly not that which modern Science at all agrees to accept. A conflict had indeed arisen, and often burst out, between popular religion and reason; and to reason St. Paul appeals, Jesus still more often appeals, as against popular religion; but science, as now understood, did not then exist; and we have a right to suppose that St. Paul would have accepted freely the conclusions of science, and as frankly have modified his views where they were untenable, as he did those which he had adopted with his Jewish education when they would no longer square with the facts of human life. And we are, as we conceive, perfectly free to examine the worth of any theological proposition which may now be set before us, unfettered by the consideration whether it does or does not tally with other propositions which may be found in writings or speeches which must always have a religious, but need not therefore have a scientific value.

Into such a proposition or propositions Mr. Arnold has condensed what the Zeit-Geist, or Time-Spirit, as it seems to him, feels about the nature of God. He endeavours to give a short definition, if we may so say, of God, and the words in which he does so are very remarkable.

"Assertions in scientific language must stand the tests of scientific examination. Neither is it that the scientific sense in us refuses to admit willingly and reverently the name of God, as a point in which the religious and the scientific sense may meet, as the least inadequate name for *that universal order which the intellect feels after as a law, and the heart feels after as a benefit.*"

Again:

"*That stream of tendency by which all things strive to fulfil the law of their being,* and which, inasmuch as our idea of real welfare resolves itself into this fulfilment of the law of one's being, man rightly deems the fountain of all goodness, and calls by the worthiest and most solemn name he can, which is God, science also might willingly own for the fountain of all goodness, and call God. But however much more than this the heart may with propriety put into its language respecting God, this is as much as science can with strictness put there."*

---

* Pp. 11, 12.

And again, with slight variation in terms: "God—the universal order by *which* all things fulfil the law of their being."* The italics are ours.

Now, whether or not we say, with Margaret in Faust, when he presented to her his somewhat more expanded creed, "Das ist alles recht schön und gut," it is certainly impossible to conclude with her,

> "Ungefähr sagt das der Pfarrer auch
> Nur mit ein bischen andern Worten;"

for what religion accepts as axiomatic, and science would scarce attempt to disprove, is, that "order" must have had an orderer, and a "stream of tendency" must flow from a source.

If, indeed, the "men of science" object most reasonably to those "men of religion" who claim to know all about God, "as if He were a man in the next street," these in their turn may not less reasonably object to a definition which seems even scientifically inadequate, in that it uses the same word for Mind and the arrangements made by mind. No real agreement can be arrived at by the use of these undistributed terms. Neither, again, does it seem to us quite true to say that "*science* might willingly own this stream of tendency for the fountain of all goodness, and call it God." For with "goodness," science has no concern, in the restricted sense in which Mr. Arnold evidently uses the term. "By their fruits ye shall know them," may be, and we believe is, an excellent test to apply in the long run to the truth of religious conclusions. It can, however, decide nothing about the truth of scientific conclusions, but only guide us to a certain degree in our applications of science. One who is not swayed by theologic prepossessions, and who certainly does not wish to put into his language respecting God more than science can with strictness place there, has spoken of Him, or that which others call God, as a great chess-player, ready always to allow strictly fair-play to man engaged in the game, yet who never passes over and never pardons a mistake. And this, which does not exclude Mind, and mind of the same kind as, though infinitely greater than, that of man, is a far more satisfac-

---

* P. 57.

tory *scientific* conception of God than is Mr. Arnold's "universal order" and "stream of tendency." We are far from saying that either conflicts with religion; in fact, we shall endeavour to shew that St. Paul's thought of God was not wholly unlike that of Mr. Huxley on one side, and he might certainly have accepted Mr. Arnold's description of His working; but such description does not seem to be indeed that which the Time-Spirit says of God.

It would be truer to say that, except where utterance is extorted from it, it would fain say nothing at all, because as yet it can say nothing adequately. It is also true to say that God's immediate working is found to be further back, and at a greater distance from us, than once it seemed, so that we can speak of Him less and less "as of a man in the next street." As the Jew once feared to look behind a thin veil, lest the glory of God should surely break out upon him, so once all the world thought that could we but see just behind anything which was strange and unaccountable, we should find the direct interference of Deity. We have, as it were, looked behind many of these occurrences, and may look behind more; space and time open out in ever-increasing volumes of distance, and we do not see the original of those laws which rule all that once seemed so lawless, or the infinite beginning, or beginner, of all finite things. Thus science, while it says by its silence that no man can by searching find out God, and we thank it for saying so, by no means denies Him; and while it refuses, wisely, to tell us scientifically what He is, it does much to rectify and set aside all unworthy conceptions of Him. The Time-Spirit may set aside certain words and definitions and statements of St. Paul; and if so, we think he would have been among the first to abandon them; but it does not set aside, as we think, the essential assumption on which his whole life was founded, that of God as an "invisible thinking principle or soul."* And this essential assumption we think Mr. Arnold's "universal order" and "stream of tendency" would set aside, though he of course would not. We think that, in his laudable care to be strictly scientific, he has stopped short of what rigid science would at least not deny. And human life is, always has been, and always

* Bishop Berkeley, Alciphron.

must be, content with probabilities, which to the heart are certainties, so long as they do not conflict with intellectual conclusions. In fact, while science can accept St. Paul's idea of God only in part; while his idea was of a God far more directly ruling his works than the Time-Spirit will allow; while we think St. Paul would, in fuller light, have accepted most of what modern science teaches, we do not think he would accept Mr. Arnold's definitions, except as leading to a conclusion which science does not, so far as we now see, contradict.

The most important, though not the most superficial, object of the book now in hand is to consider certain doctrines, or schemes of doctrine, and to "compare them, for correspondence with facts, and for scientific validity, with the teaching of St. Paul." "What in St. Paul is secondary and subordinate," these schemes of doctrine have "made primary and essential; what in St. Paul is figure, and belongs to the sphere of feeling," they have "transported into the sphere of intellect, and made formula. On the other hand, what is with St. Paul primary," has been "treated as subordinate; and what is with him thesis, and belonging, so far as anything in religion can properly be said thus to belong," has been "made image and figure."*

The first of these schemes of doctrine is naturally that known under the name of Calvinism, though it scarce needs to be said, that however certain Protestant Confessions have elaborated the doctrines so called, their essential and characteristic portions have always existed in the Church since Christianity was formulated, and call to their defence the mighty authority of Augustine, chief name of a school never without great and worthy representatives. And while only professional theologians would be able to dissect and explain the whole scheme, its central assertion is known to all, that "God decrees at His mere good pleasure some men to salvation and others to reprobation." As Mr. Arnold puts it extremely well, "the passiveness of man, the activity of God, are the great features in this scheme; there is very little of what man thinks and does, very much of what God thinks and does; and what God thinks and does is described with such particularity, that

---

* Pp. 13, 9.

the figure we have used of the man in the next street cannot but recur strongly to our minds."*

St. Paul would, we believe, be extremely astonished at Calvinism as expanded in modern days, but that is no proof that he did not implicitly hold it. If he held its germ, we have a right to make him responsible for its development, though we may consider that the contemplation of its development might have made him reconsider his earlier position. And a part of it we think he did hold—so much as is contained in Mr. Arnold's words, "the passiveness of man, the activity of God," which are in fact a summary and condensation of a large part of his teaching. The passages in which he speaks of himself as "separated from his mother's womb" by God, and all those other stock passages about men in general on which Calvinism rests, need not here be quoted at length. It will be enough to refer to the one image of God as the Potter, and man as the clay in His hand. Of this Mr. Arnold says that it might seem the use of the word "prothesis," purpose, in St. Paul's argument, sent St. Paul off, as a word so often does, and "lured him on into speculative mazes, and involved him at last in an embarrassment from which he impatiently tore himself by the harsh and unedifying image of the clay and the potter. But this is not so."† Rather, thinks Mr. Arnold, he was led into difficulty by his tendency to Judaize—to regard, that is, the Hebrew ancient Scriptures as of sacred, almost talismanic importance. In these he found the idea of reprobation as an idea of Jewish theology; and though he never consciously abandoned it, it took a completely secondary place in his system. "The very phrase about the clay and the potter is not Paul's own; he does but repeat a stock theological figure." Now admitting that Paul's use of Scripture is absolutely uncritical, that he did employ its phrases as though they had an oracular value, we submit that the stock theological figure is here so varied as to make it absolutely St. Paul's own, and to present it in a wholly new light. The figure does not appear in the Old Testament as that of a God who makes anything for the purpose of destruction, or with the foreknowledge that it would be destroyed. Jeremiah uses the metaphor in great-

---

* P. 17. † P. 97.

est detail. "I went down to the potter's house, and behold he wrought a work on the double stone. And the vessel that he was making became marred in the hand of the potter; so he made it over again a different vessel, as seemed good in the eyes of the potter to make. And the word of Jehovah came to me, saying, Can I not deal with you as this potter, house of Israel? is Jehovah's saying; behold, as clay in the potter's hand, so are you in my hand, house of Israel." (Jer. xviii. 3—6, Dr. Rowland Williams' Translation.) Now the thought here, as we think Mr. Maurice has somewhere pointed out, is not so much the arbitrariness as the patience of God, who will bring men to be what he would have them be in the end, as the potter eventually twists the clay to the shape he originally intended, stubborn soever as the clay may be. And to this idea Dr. Williams refers* when he suggests that "the train of thought here helps those who find in St. Paul's election a favourable state instead of an absolute destiny." He himself, however, seems to think that "the modern notion of marred lives perishing, and of their materials being re-cast, answers the image more nearly than the theological conception of souls created to endure probation and doom."

Our own opinion is that St. Paul took this figure, consecrated by long Hebrew usage and by a variety of writers, and gave it a turn to suit his own conception of the Divine Nature, a turn Augustinian and Calvinistic. And this conception seems true to the facts of life, so long as there is not added to and blended with it another idea which falsifies and confuses it. Our whole life is a struggle within the bars of an iron necessity, the only freedom from which is acquiescence with our state.

> "The stern necessity of things
> On every side our being rings;
> Our eager aims, still questing round,
> Find exit none from that great bound.
> Where once her law dictates the way,
> The wise thinks only to obey,
> Take life as she has ordered it,
> And, come what may of it, submit,
> Submit, submit."†

---

* Hebrew Prophets, note, in loc. cit.

† A. H. Clough.

The very fact that mind is free and can transcend the conditions of our life,—the very strife between high aspirations and base desires, linked, as St. Paul thought, only to this body, "for he that is dead is freed from sin,"—the physical difficulties presented by place and time,—all force on us the fact that our liberty is only that of the bird in a cage, who may flutter its wings and move indeed, but within the limits of hard iron wires. And what is the prayer, "Thy will be done," but the expression of a wish that our desires may be circumscribed by the narrow boundaries within which we are free,—that we may not, to borrow other metaphors which express the same truth, dash ourselves against the thick-bossed shield of God's judgments, or place ourselves under the grinding of his wheels? What made this conception tolerable to St. Paul was not, we think, that he held this doctrine in a secondary place, nor that certain other views contradicted and corrected it; but, firstly, that he did not hold this destiny, this necessity, to be a mere law, but a Mind with which his own mind could sympathize, and which his own mind could partially understand. He thought of God as of a "magnified man," to use Mr. Arnold's expression, though he did not think of Him or talk of Him "as if He were in the next street." He thought of Him as Mr. Huxley thinks of his chess-player, not inhuman though stern, not swayed by weak considerations to give his fellow-player the game when it is not fairly won, but who knows that every mistake and loss will teach man to play better in future, and who would make man eventually, what the serpent of the legend falsely promised, "like gods, knowing good and evil." And indeed it is not possible that man should think of any superior being except as an idealized self, inadequate as he knows this comparison to be. Justice, Love, Truth, to have any meaning at all, must be those same qualities in God which man calls by those names in self, unflecked by those evils which tarnish and diminish them in all but God.

But more than this humanity, so to speak, in God, another thought, or rather absence of a modern conception, made "man's passiveness, God's activity," bearable by St. Paul, and by many in these days to whom the thought of the damnation of others would bring no consolation. There is in St. Paul no trace of the monstrous doctrine of an eter-

nal death, no hint that he believed this life the only sphere for man. It seems to us that when he speaks of a judgment and an end of the then existing state of things, we moderns have often read into his words an idea of finality which has therein no place whatever, and which idea of finality alone forbids the reconciliation of the over-mastering "activity of God" with those other passages in which the activity of man is spoken of. And this activity of man, after all, only consists in such a resignation of self, that self-work becomes God's work, and activity passiveness, when God shall be all in all. We do not think there is any very great difference between ourselves and Mr. Arnold in what we have here said, because the philosophy of no modern poet, save him from whom we have already quoted, embodies so much the sense of the powerlessness of individual men; we only do not think he has quite sufficiently credited St. Paul with that same sense of unfreedom which is the secret of sadness passing into content for so many noble and aspiring minds, nor has he quite realized that the hell-fire doctrine is that which makes the distinction between St. Paul's faith and that of many men who have based their teaching on his words.

More fully and cordially do we agree with all that Mr. Arnold says about the tenet of Justification, described by him thus lucidly:

"It is the doctrine of Anselm, adopted and developed by Luther, set forth in the Confession of Augsburg, and current through all the popular theology of our day. We shall find it in almost any popular hymn we happen to take.....By Adam's fall, God's justice and mercy were placed in conflict. God could not follow His mercy without violating His justice. Christ by his satisfaction gave the Father the right and power to follow His mercy, and to make with man the covenant of free justification by faith, whereby if a man has a sure trust and confidence that his sins are forgiven him in virtue of the satisfaction made to God for them by the death of Christ, he is held clear of sin by God, and admitted to salvation. This doctrine has an essential affinity with Calvinism; indeed, Calvinism is but this doctrine of original sin and justification, *plus* the doctrine of predestination."*

This dogma has, it seems to us, no agreement with the

* Pp. 23, 24.

facts of human life, no such truth as Calvinism, whose falseness consists in what is added; but it is at once profoundly immoral and profoundly unscientific. It is unscientific, as taking as the history of the starting-point of the human race that which all science and all criticism pronounce mere legend; immoral, as making the innocent suffer for the guilty, *not* because the innocent, in order to do good, brings himself under the operation of relentless law, which others have violated—as some physician may expose himself to contagion to save persons who have brought about their diseases by their own neglect of sanitary measures—but as a deliberate arrangement by which the innocent should suffer for sins never done. It has the immorality also of conscious fiction, since according to the theory, Christ, being divine, cannot die, it was impossible he should be holden of death; and therefore not to have done what he is said to have done would have been the deepest-dyed selfishness, while in the doing was scant merit. The substitution scheme makes the life and death of Christ void of all its infinite beauty and pathos, and reduces it to a level far below the noble sacrifice of many a heroic, but not transcendently virtuous, man.

But, says one—"Objectors to the vicarious atonement of Christ are all open to the charge of this fallacy, that they draw an analogy of the duty of one man to another, to decide that God as a Governor of the world can forgive sin without an expiation; whereas the true analogy, if any is allowable, is to the dealing of a government with the individual. And a government to be justified must enforce the penalties of transgression against its laws." Now it is quite true that there are some violations of the laws of society which are visited by money payment, and the law is not too careful to inquire whether or not these are paid by the delinquent; but to transfer this to God is to confuse the whole difference between crime and sin, and make our admitted human miscarriages of justice the rule by which works a just and righteous God. With the objection hinted in the words just quoted, "if any analogy is allowable," we have dealt already in laying it down that words must mean the same when applied to God and man, if they are to have a meaning of any sort. Now if we thought that St. Paul's teaching indeed revolved round this central doctrine, which

cannot be qualified, and rendered, as is the doctrine of Election, harmful or harmless by what is added or not added to it, since it must be accepted as a whole or denied as a whole, we should incline to think his whole philosophy and theology "suspect." But we do not think this doctrine is there, and agree most cordially with all that Mr. Arnold says on this point. After a most careful and exhaustive analysis of St. Paul's argument in the Epistle to the Romans, he sums up thus:

"The historical transgression of Adam occupies, it will be observed, in Paul's ideas, by no means the primary, fundamental, all-important place which it holds in the ideas of Puritanism. 'This is our original sin, the bitter root of all our actual transgressions, in thought, word and deed.' Ah no! Paul did not go to the book of Genesis for his authentic information on this head. He went to experience for it. '*I see*,' he says, 'a law in my members fighting against the law of my mind and bringing me into captivity.' This is the essential testimony respecting the rise of sin to Paul—the rise of it in his own heart, and in the heart of all the men who hear him. At quite a later stage in his conception of the religious life, in quite a subordinate capacity, and for the mere purpose of illustration, comes in the allusion to Adam, and to what is called original sin.....He entirely subordinates it to his purpose of illustration, using it just as he might have used it had he believed, which undoubtedly he did not, that it was merely a symbolical legend, though a very primitive and profound one, as well as perfectly familiar to himself and his hearers. 'Think,' he says, 'how in Adam's fall one man's one transgression involved all men in a punishment; then estimate the blessedness of our boon in Christ, where one man's one righteousness involves a world of transgressors in blessing!' This is not a scientific doctrine of corruption inherited through Adam's fall; it is a rhetorical use of Adam's fall in a passing allusion to it."*

He uses the legend, in fact, just as he used that of the rock which followed the wanderings of the Israelites in the wilderness, and much as a modern Englishman might use one of Shakespeare's historical incidents, neither affirming nor denying the truth of what is therein stated, because neither the truth or falsehood affects the rhetorical argument. He attributes of course a greater sanctity to the

---

* Pp. 94, 95.

source whence he drew the story, and no doubt believed it himself; but it would not greatly have affected him, and certainly not his use of it, had it been proven false.

In both the schemes of doctrine we have considered, faith plays an important part. "As soon as the elect have faith in Jesus Christ, that is as soon as they give their consent heartily and repentantly in the sense of deserved condemnation to the covenant of grace, God justifies them by imputing to them that perfect obedience which Christ gave to the law, and the satisfaction also which, upon the cross, Christ gave to justice in their name."* "God gives in a moment such a faith in the blood of His Son as translates us out of darkness into light, out of sin and fear into holiness and happiness."† And of this same word faith, St. Paul's writings are also full. Did he mean by faith in Christ what is meant by those who hold either side of what is called by Mr. Arnold Puritan doctrine? He thinks, and we agree with him, that St. Paul meant nothing of the sort. He identified himself with Christ by faith, and by so doing, "he found a point in which the mighty world outside man, and the weak world inside him, seemed to combine for his salvation. The struggling stream of duty, which had not volume enough to bear him to his goal, was suddenly reinforced by the immense tidal wave of sympathy and emotion."‡

The idea floating in the mind of the writer is condensed a few lines below into a definition—"fast attachment to an unseen power of goodness," or, as it might be also worded, *a faculty of realizing an ideal*. This is what, as we believe, St. Paul meant by faith; and "fast attachment to an unseen power of goodness," is an altogether better wording than the somewhat obscure one of the Epistle to the Hebrews, "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." This ideal, this unseen power of goodness, was Jesus, whom Paul had never seen, to whose pure and idealized manhood his thoughts perhaps insensibly and unconsciously joined all that had been said in his Scriptures of a divine word and an anointed king. And in so doing he was following the guidance of the Time-Spirit of his own days, which as the sacred nation fell to pieces occupied itself

---

* P. 16. † P. 25. ‡ P. 70.

more and more with transcendental hopes of a coming kingdom of God. But, as Mr. Arnold says most truly, "For us, who approach Christianity through a scholastic theology, it is Christ's divinity which establishes his being without sin. For Paul, who approached Christianity through his personal experience, it was Christ's being without sin which established his divinity. The large and complete conception of righteousness to which he himself had slowly and late, and only by Christ's help, awakened, in Christ he seemed to see existing absolutely and naturally. The devotion to this conception . . . of which he himself was strongly and deeply conscious, he saw in Christ still stronger by far, and deeper than in himself. But for attaining the righteousness of God, for reaching an absolute conformity with the moral order and with God's will, he saw no such impotence existing in Christ's case as his own. . . . As many as are led by the spirit of God, says Paul, are the sons of God. If this is so with even us, who live to God so feebly, and who render such an imperfect obedience, how much more is he who lives to God entirely, and who renders an unalterable obedience, the unique and only Son of God."* Equally excellent is what is said of Paul's application to Jesus of the doctrines of the divine Logos and of the Messiah. To the general sense of the word faith, St. Paul gradually added a meaning of his own—identification with Christ.

We are thus brought face to face with the problem of his whole religious life, so far as it depended on his mental organization. It is often held that the mystical man is unpractical; but, like many other hasty generalizations, this is very partially true. St. Paul was thoroughly practical; in fact, it is true to say that "his originality lies in the effort to make the significance of all the processes, however mystical, of the religious life palpable even to the intellect,"† and so bear directly on daily actions; but there was a tinge of mysticism through his whole nature. We "employ the word mysticism, and its cognate terms, as involving the idea not merely of initiation into something hidden, but, beyond this, of an internal manifestation of the Divine to the intuition or in the feeling of the secluded soul."‡ This mys-

---

* Pp. 63, 64. † P. 83.

‡ Hours with the Mystics, Vol. I. p. 22.

tical side of St. Paul's religion he clothed in words which the whole Christian Church since his time has in a measure adopted—words which science cannot sanction, but the heart can surely apprehend, oneness with Christ. For him, no doubt, Jesus Christ was a full, complete and sufficient revelation of God to his soul, was a link, and, as it seemed to him, the only link, by which his humanity might ally itself to the Godhead; he could be one with Christ, and Christ was one with God. It never occurred to him to ask, or even think, whether, in so far as he subdued self, and followed the divine law he perceived in him warring with the tendencies to evil, he would or would not have attained to union with the divine, even if Jesus had not lived and died. Such a question would have been eminently beside the mark; he knew how he had attained to a higher life than ever before; he had done so by sympathy with Jesus, and he proclaimed his way of apprehending God as an all-sufficient way. He did not dream of inquiring whether the life of Christ was a final revelation of God to every human soul; but he threw his whole heart into the service of the highest he saw, in the spirit of Mr. Tennyson's noble words, applied to heavenly, not earthly, love; but with him the devotion was given, which in the poem the speaker had failed to give.

"Ah, my God!
What might I not have made of thy fair world
Had I but loved Thy highest creature here?
It was my duty to have loved the highest;
It surely was my profit had I known;
It would have been my pleasure had I seen:
We needs must love the highest when we see it."

And as he had opposed the religious sentiment which had gathered round Jesus, whom now he recognized as the glorified Lord of his soul, yet felt that this was forgiven, burnt away in the flames of his new love, his thought might have clothed itself in other most appropriate words in the same poem:

"And blessed be the King, who hath forgiven
My wickedness to him, and left me hope
That in mine own heart I can live down sin,
And be his mate hereafter in the heavens
Before high God."

But St. Paul's "genius for godliness," as to a large extent it was satisfied before he became a Christian, so would have been satisfied with whatever better religion came in his way, and it for a time would have seemed to him absolute and final truth. We do not of course, in saying this, forget his own assertions that he was "chief of sinners" and the like; but it does not follow that we should rate him at his own low standard, nor even that he at other times and in other moods would thus have rated himself. Some members of the Positivist school of religion have used this, to us indubitable, characteristic of St. Paul to the disparagement of his Master. Their argument is, in fact, this: Paul being very great, threw the whole force of his practical mind into the religion which was at hand; found it weak and left it strong; shewed, in fact, his own power by what he made of a name in itself of no great worth; and so, with consistency, they have left out of their calendar the very name of Jesus, and consecrated a month to Paul. To us, however, the argument seems to bear the other way. If Paul, being so great, was so overpowered and penetrated with the rumoured sanctity of him whom he had never seen, as to wish to lose his whole individuality and merge his very self in the self of another, we may take his testimony to the infinite grace and loveableness, the divine charm and winning power of him, who even so early in Church history had taken his place as the point in which met and were fused the human and divine.

But this is not to say that those many fair souls which do not accept religion according to the pattern of St. Paul, even supposing they interpret him aright, are therefore alien from Christ, or even that those who think that Christianity itself is not a final revelation, have no knowledge of the life of God in their soul. St. Paul would have been the first to protest against such teaching as this; and, in fact, there are passages, notably 1 Cor. xv. 23—28, which seem to imply that even in his own view the kingdom of Christ might be a temporary dispensation. He certainly himself varied most largely in his view of what that kingdom should be; he certainly admitted vast differences within the religion he preached; can we think he would have narrowed religion itself to one phase of it, and that phase to Pauline doctrine, even if we could make sure of knowing

exactly "what St. Paul thought, a man so separated from us by time, race, training and circumstances"?*

But to return to Mr. Arnold's estimate of this theology. No one who has studied St. Paul ever so superficially can have failed to see that the resurrection from the dead is the key-stone of his system. The ordinary sense which these words bear is, no doubt, that of Christ's bodily resurrection on earth after his physical death on the cross, and St. Paul is taken to mean that the bodily resurrection of Jesus is the pledge of the believer's bodily resurrection in a future world. It is perhaps not too much to say that this is *the* stumbling-block alike of modern science and modern criticism. It would require a treatise even to summarize the difficulties presented by this miracle, over and above those involved in the conception of miracle at all. Not only does criticism find the accounts hopelessly irreconcilable, not only does it find these irreconcilable statements far more inwoven with and inseparable from the story of the Gospels than those of the miraculous birth of Jesus, but it also fails to see how the resuscitation of a corrupted body can be inferred from that of one which, *ex hypothesi*, saw no corruption. Not only, again, does science find that, since corruption begins in the human body from the very moment that life ceases, the death on the cross was either no real death, or, which seems abhorrent alike to reason and feeling, life was restored again to that which had begun to rot; not only was another and abiding miracle required to prevent the exquisite sensitiveness of gaping wounds, but the very laws of time and space and gravity were suspended, so far as the body of Jesus was concerned. The insistance, as it generally appears, on the resurrection by St. Paul, brings this farther difficulty. If he dropped out of sight so completely the miraculous birth, that it may seem doubtful if he even heard of it; if he makes little or nothing of all but this of the evidential side of Christianity as it was presented to him, so that it would even seem that, taking him as our interpreter of Christianity, we might disbelieve or ignore what he did not know, or, knowing, left on one side,—all the more important becomes that on which he insists over and over again with such vigour and persistence.

---

* P. 29.

Mr. Arnold cuts the knot boldly. He does not of course deny that St. Paul held the doctrine of the physical resurrection of Jesus. Had he "been asked whether he held the doctrine of the resurrection in its physical and miraculous sense, as well as in his own spiritual and mystical sense, he would have replied with entire confidence that he did. Very likely it would have been impossible to him to imagine his theology without it. But

> "Below the surface stream, shallow and light,
> Of what we *say* we feel; below the stream,
> As light, of what we *think* we feel,—there flows,
> With noiseless current strong, obscure and deep,
> The central stream of what we feel indeed;"

and by this alone we are truly characterized."* He goes on to shew that St. Paul really held the resurrection mainly in its mystical sense; that as the only true life for him was mortification of the deeds of the flesh by the spirit, and obedience to righteousness, and true death the living after the flesh, so "resurrection is the rising within the sphere of our visible earthly existence from death in this sense to life in this sense."† But while, of course, we are far from denying that the mystical sense of Christ's resurrection was very prominent in Paul's mind, and was that on which he insisted with reference to the believer, we attribute a far greater importance to his faith in the physical and miraculous. He also believed, no doubt, in our own physical resurrection in the same material bodies as we put off at death, but felt the weakness of insisting on the resurrection of Jesus as a proof of this. Hence, in his great chapter on this special subject, he speaks generally of the resurrection of Jesus, but for detail draws an analogy from the germination of seed—not indeed a satisfactory one, but one of which it was by no means likely that any man would then see the inadequacy. Whoever has read attentively Locke's note on Identity and Diversity will remember the inextricable confusion in which he involves his antagonist, the Bishop of Worcester, with regard to the revivification of matter and the growth of the seed, but will remember also that the Bishop's interpretation of St. Paul is after all what St. Paul, not being a scientific man, probably meant;

---

* P. 83. † P. 84.

and that, as Locke himself admitted that "in the Scripture we find little revelation of natural philosophy,"* the Bishop is not the only person whose arguments are overthrown.

That Paul's belief in a physical rising of Jesus is very far more important than Mr. Arnold admits it to be, is clear to us from this consideration, that the spiritual idea is in Paul's theology based on the natural idea, as entirely as the spiritual conception of Christ is based on the natural life of Jesus. If the life of Jesus had no real existence, then, however more important and prominent may be the ideas of Messiah and the incarnate Logos, they fall for the time to the ground, unbuttressed by the human life; and so St. Paul's whole argument for the spiritual resurrection of the believer is based on, and stands or falls with, the physical rising of Jesus. We do not, of course, mean that this is the true argument against a life of sin, or the only one St. Paul could have used had others seemed to him needful, but it is that he *does* use, and it seems to him valid and sufficient. But though we insist on this, as considering that Mr. Arnold credits St. Paul with the spirit of our age rather than his own, and that growth in religion is hindered rather than advanced by forcing the men of the Bible to speak with modern tongues and think with modern brains, yet, once having asserted that the physical aspect of the resurrection was more prominent than he allows it to be in the writings of St. Paul, we are cordially at one with him in all that he says of the mystical aspect. And simply strengthening the word *accepted* in the following passage, we regard the greater part of it as a most admirable, true and complete criticism on the progress of St. Paul's teaching, from the crude and material views of his earlier Christianity to the vaguer but more spiritual utterances of "Paul the aged."

"That Paul, as we have said, *accepted* the physical miracle of Christ's resurrection and ascension as a part of the signs and wonders which accompanied Christianity, there can be no doubt. Just in the same manner he *accepted* the eschatology, as it is called, of his nation—their doctrine of the final things, and of the summons by a trumpet in the sky to judgment; he *accepted*

---

* An Essay concerning Human Understanding, 22nd Edition, Vol. I. p. 358. London, 1812.

Satan, hierarchies of angels, and an approaching end of the world. What we deny is, that his acceptance of the former gives his teaching its essential characters any more than his acceptance of the latter." [Here, as has been pointed out, we venture in some degree to differ.] "We should but be continuing with strict logical development Paul's essential line of thought, if we said that the true ascension and glorified reign of Christ was the triumph and reign of his spirit, of his real life, *far more operative after his death on the cross than before it;* and that in this sense most truly he, and all who persevere to the end as he did, are 'sown in weakness, but raised in power.' Paul himself, however, did not distinctly continue his thought thus, and neither will we do so for him. How far Paul himself knew that he had gone in his irresistible bent to find, for each of the data of his religion, that side of moral and spiritual significance which as a mere sign and wonder it had not and could not have—what data he himself was conscious of having transferred, through following this bent, from the first rank in importance to the second—we cannot know with any certainty. That the bent existed, that Paul felt it existed, and that it establishes a wide difference between the earliest Epistles and the latest, is beyond question. Already, in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, he declares that though he had heretofore known Christ after the flesh, yet henceforth he knew him so no more; and in the Epistle to the Romans accordingly, he rejects the notion of dwelling on the miraculous Christ, on the descent into hell, and on the ascent into heaven, and fixes the attention solely (?) on the spirit of Christ, and on the effects produced by an acquaintance with it. In the same Epistle, in like manner, the kingdom of God, of which, to the Thessalonians, he described the advent in such materializing and popularly Judaic language, has become 'righteousness and peace, and joy in the holy spirit.'"*

There are scattered throughout this little treatise many gems of happy and discriminating criticism, such as "Paul knows nothing of a sacrificial atonement; what Paul knows of is a reconciling sacrifice."† "The endless words wasted upon *sanctification*, a magical filling with goodness and holiness, flow from a mere mistake in translating; ἁγιασμός means consecration, a setting apart to holy service."‡ But we must quote no more; our readers have seen, or surely will see, the book; and what we have written is enough, or more than enough, to aid the examination of it. We should

---

* Pp. 87—89. † P. 102. ‡ P. 112.

be glad to see it reprinted, expanded by a paraphrase, which Mr. Arnold could do so well, of the harder passages of the leading Epistles, docked of personalities. We smile at these in a Magazine article, but they blemish a permanent work, especially because, like most sharp sayings, they fail now and then in being strictly accurate. For instance: "Last came the interpreter, in whose slowly relaxing grasp we still lie,—the heavy-handed Protestant Philistine. Sincere, gross of perception, prosaic, he saw in Paul's mystical idea of man's investiture with the righteousness of God, nothing but a strict legal transaction, and reserved all his imagination for hell and the New Jerusalem, and his foretaste of them." * It was a worthier and more imaginative antagonist than a mere heavy-handed Protestant Philistine, who returned our own copy with the following words, not the less touching because we so absolutely disagree with much that they say and all that they imply.

"The reconciliation-by-example scheme may seem a beautiful one; it is a rational one, one for the wise of the earth, for the intellectual; but I do not believe it will ever give real peace here, or that it contains a constraining motive to regenerate the life. The reconciliation by non-imputation (2 Cor. v. 19) and justification 'freely by His grace,' may be perverted into a formula by hypocrites and mere professors; but, when embraced in the heart, is a well of water springing up to everlasting life. If the former be true, then the love of all that is self-sacrificing constrains me, and I live to the spirit of self-sacrifice in Socrates, my teachers, my friends, and pre-eminently in Christ. If the latter, then Christ only is the author of salvation, and he only is entitled to the loving self-dedication which testifies to my gratitude. Forgive me for going on. I look upon Mr. Arnold's book with pain, as an instrument, however unintentionally, for robbing our Blessed Master of the travail of His Soul. I hope I do not pain you by what I say; but I could not bear to return the book, and leave the impression with you that I admired it, or thought it could help our Lord's cause." †

These words, written as they are by a laymen, who is not a Puritan, in Mr. Arnold's sense of the word, nor a Philistine, lead to the thought how far the assumption which underlies all the rest of this treatise is true, that Puritanism only is responsible for the scheme of theology

* P. 116.

† MS. letter.

which is treated with so great scorn. Mr. Arnold's point is, that Puritanism, i.e. Dissent, exists for the sake of propagating these very opinions of St. Paul which are here shewn not to be his at all, and that therefore Dissent has no *locus standi*; while the "historic Church," although no doubt holding these same views, did not come into existence for the sake of propagating them, is therefore more free to modify its tenets, and has in it more power of growth. And there is here given us an interesting little sketch of the various attempts made to render more stringent than they now are the formularies of the historic Church, tending to prove that "the Church as regards doctrine was for opening; Puritanism was for narrowing."*

But Mr. Arnold's historic sketch is incomplete. If any congregations stand out as those to whom pre-eminently the name Puritan would apply, it is certainly those who seceded from the Church of England after the passing of the Act of Uniformity. These, becoming Dissenters, held together to a large extent in their previous congregations, and built chapels in which to worship, under the pastoral care of the Puritan ministers who had seceded with them. Having felt the constraint of the formularies which had squeezed them out, they inserted no conditions of doctrine in the trust-deeds of their chapels; yet no one can doubt that the founders and earliest ministers of those chapels believed they would continue to the end Presbyterian and Puritan, not only in organization but in doctrine. The upshot of this secession, however, has been, that these Puritan congregations have moved a great deal faster than the historic Church, and have become, almost without exception, "Unitarian" in their theology; that is, as all the world knows, untied to any "scheme of theology" whatever, and free to follow the teachings of the Time-Spirit, which is, as we think, none other than the Spirit of God, whithersoever it may lead. It is by no means always true to say that Puritanism necessarily continues to uphold that dogma for the support of which it began to exist, nor that it always existed only for the sake of dogma; there are, we think, distinct signs that the coherence which now exists between Congregationalist churches is giving way, and

---

* P. 131.

that these, more and more growing independent congregations, will insensibly follow the same line which the English Presbyterian churches have already taken.

That the Time-Spirit has more effect on the Church of England, in spite of her Articles, than on most of the Nonconformist Churches, we do not dispute; a firm belief in the fact seems indeed the greatest reason why those persons already within its boundaries should, if they conscientiously can, still adhere to it. But it by no means seems to us so true as it seems to Mr. Arnold, that the doctrines which he attacks and strives to shew are not those of St .Paul, are buttressed more firmly by Puritanism than by the historic Church or Churches. Calvinism, in its naked form, no doubt is so, but only because the Time-Spirit rejects this most utterly and avowedly, and because, while our higher education is to so large an extent still practically confined to the Church of England, the ministry of Dissent is greatly shielded from the salutary influences of that Spirit. But the vast majority of pulpits in the Church of England ring with the doctrine of Atonement in its coarsest form; the bleeding crucifix in every Roman Church draws the attention to the physical phenomena of the death, rather than to the holy life, of Jesus; while the historic Church seasons of Easter and Ascension-tide, of which Dissent takes no official notice, lift into the brightest glare of light the dogmas of a material resurrection and ascension. We say nothing of Christmas and its teachings of a miraculous birth, because this is not, and is not asserted to be, one of the Pauline doctrines, which alone are our subject.

The differences between Conformity and Nonconformity seem to us, then, to depend far less than Mr. Arnold would have it, on St. Paul's beliefs, or any interpretation of them; but this is not a matter on which we desire further to touch. We have said thus much only because we wish to insist that all the Christian Churches must either profoundly modify their theological views, or set themselves in determined and ever-increasing opposition to the Spirit of the Time. The Roman Church has taken this latter course; Protestantism, of no kind, has as yet put itself in *formal* opposition to science and modern thought, though there can be no doubt that the tone of the Churches and

of Science shew there is a vast danger of their drifting asunder more and more.

And, as Mr. Arnold very truly says, "a triumph of Puritanism," that is, of all those doctrines he has in this treatise attacked, "is abundantly possible,"*—in which sad triumph the men of science will be fain to stand aside, and wait for that new faith which must evolve itself, *is* evolving itself, from the sciences they pursue. Or, again, it may be that this faith will meet and coalesce with a Christianity freed from inadmissible tenets of popular theology, which shall retain all that is vital in Christianity and the Church, and under the influence of these fundamental changes Christianity and the Church will be free to develop themselves.

But it may be said, it *is* said, that Christianity is identical with a certain congeries of dogmata, and that to get rid of these is to overthrow true Christianity, and then apply that time-honoured and sacred name to the vague and formless religion which has usurped its place. What are these dogmata? The miraculous birth of Jesus? No one will assert for a moment that this forms any part of St. Paul's scheme, or that he who leaves it so absolutely out of sight was not a Christian, since nine-tenths of *formal* Christianity as it now exists are drawn from the writings of St. Paul. Election and Reprobation? We have tried to shew that there is a sense in which these doctrines are true, and that all that is evil in them they owe to another which has been tacked to them, which doctrine of Eternal Damnation can certainly not be gathered from St. Paul. Neither can criticism gather it from the words of Jesus, unless, abandoning its true functions, it takes metaphor for argument, figure for fact, and parable for narrative. Or, again, is the Atonement, as understood by popular theology, such a dogma? Mr. Arnold's explanation of St. Paul's argument has been already quoted and made our own. And we may say the same of his words of St. Paul's view of the divinity of Christ. There remains the one dogma of the Resurrection. With this stands and falls the whole fabric of miracles which have gathered round the life of Jesus; and on this, in some divergence from Mr. Arnold, we think St. Paul certainly rests his Christianity. And has not Mr.

---

* P. xxxiii.

Arnold, in his zeal to shew that St. Paul did not so rest his doctrine, been unconsciously influenced by the very feeling against which he so vigorously protests—the feeling that the apostle's words are oracles, having a value in themselves greater than that lent them by the ability and knowledge of the writer? There are few superstitions which die harder than this one; none of us are not at times affected by it. We forget that, in an uncritical and unscientific age, even the giants of thought must have imperfections in argument and lapses into credulity, from which far looser thinkers, far less religious men, are in these days necessarily free. Mr. Keble's lines have a wider application than he would have claimed for them, when he says, that now

> "What sages would have died to learn,
> Is taught by cottage dames."

But that hunger and thirst after a righteousness which St. Paul found incarnate in Jesus, that affection for the unseen Teacher, who was yet to him the revelation of all holiness, the centre and fount of all love, was surely, had he known it, utterly independent of the question whether that Teacher had or had not risen from the dead. The relation that he had so risen was an argument to St. Paul that he lived ever; but it is impossible to think his religion would have been essentially other than it was, even if he had not had the vivid assurance of the fact on which, as it seemed to him, he based so much of what he believed. The worth of the intuitions of great and holy men is often quite independent of the arguments which seem to them sufficient in favour of those intuitions. There is perhaps no single book in the whole range of literature which speaks more wonderfully to the feeling in human nature that there must be a future state than does the Phædo of Plato, and yet nothing can be more weak, unsatisfactory and illogical, than the reasoning on which his positions are based.

In fact, as it seems to us, the whole genuine Christianity of St. Paul has higher value apart from the doctrine on which he set so great store. To him, it was an aid to faith; to us, it is a difficulty. To him, it supported Christian doctrine; to us, it overweights it. To him, it seemed proof of the eternal life; to us, it brings into theories of that life which seem in accordance with God's dealings, material

ideas which science refuses to sanction. And we think that here it will be found that any theology which coalesces with the higher scientific thought must perforce part company with St. Paul. But still the views which he adopted will ever stand to the thought of the future, as did the story of Adam to his own thought, a fair and beautiful legend, to be spiritualized as he spiritualized it, even when he thought it fact. And when men question, as they always will, what the rising from the dead should mean, the future theology will answer more and more in St. Paul's later rather than in his earlier language. It will ever be the glory of this great apostle that he, more than any other who had not known Jesus in the flesh, discerned in that fair life and death a holy pattern, and a centre of enthusiastic affection for all ages yet to come.

There have been, and there may yet be, other readings and interpretations of that life: perhaps each has done and will do its part in making the life that was lived and the death that was died stand out more clearly. But none has yet equalled that interpretation given by St. Paul, in bringing before the human mind the power for righteousness exercised by Jesus, and the revelation of God which can be given in and through man.

Therefore the theology of the future—if indeed Puritanism does not triumph, if indeed a reformed theology shall coalesce with an extended science—will not break with St. Paul, even while it will not follow him in his every belief, or admit the cogency of his every argument. And, if not with him, still less with his Divine Master, in whose service his own life was transfigured, and with whom he passed from death unto life. However certain popular opinions may be disregarded, it cannot be pretended that to return more and more to the words of Jesus, to dwell more and more on the facts of his life, when sifted and found to *be* facts, is to set aside the religion of Christ and drop the name of Christianity.

What God may send of revelation, or, which comes to the same thing, what powers of discovery He may give to man in the future, who may presume to say? But none has as yet shewn more clearly than Jesus Christ what the life of God, so far as we can conceive it, must be, and what we must be to be like Him. Yet that we may understand

Jesus more fully, and find how far what he revealed tallies with those other facts about God which none but Himself reveals through science, there is need of an ever fresh and fresh sifting and examination of all documents which profess to speak of him, together with the writings and lives of his immediate followers. To such fresh examination of the teaching of perhaps the greatest among them, the little book we have here reviewed has given great help in our own case, and will, we believe, be useful to others also, when disentangled from passing controversies. We have found much to admire even where we were unable to concur; but, as our readers will have seen, our agreement with Mr. Arnold's whole drift and spirit has much more than counterbalanced our differences with him on some points of detail.

C. Kegan Paul.

VI.—THE EXPERIENCE-PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGIOUS BELIEF.

The Philosophical Works of John Locke. London: H. G. Bohn. 1854.

Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind. By James Mill. Edited, with additional Notes, by J. S. Mill. London: Longmans. 1869.

We do not aim at giving any detailed criticism of the above-named works. They are placed under the eye of the reader as being respectively the earliest and the latest influential exponents of a philosophical movement, which perhaps more than any other has proved itself congenial to English thought and feeling, and which is now largely swaying for good or ill the direction of public opinion upon many questions of high moment to our national character. Believing, as we do, that from every philosophy which claims to give an exhaustive analysis of the facts of man's consciousness, we have a right to expect some adequate account of the phenomena of religious belief, we think that it will

not be altogether time misspent if we interrogate the masters of this school of thought, and find whether they have any satisfactory deliverance to give in answer to the question, What can we know of God?—a question which, amid the present startling disintegration of theological opinion, presses with daily increasing urgency upon a widening circle of thoughtful minds. If we judge only by the more obvious signs of mental tendency around, it would seem difficult to point out any epoch in the history of Christian Europe, in which religious belief has been placed in a more serious strait than that which now distresses it. In the last century, if a Catholic was led to doubt the validity of the claims of Pope and Church, or a Protestant had his faith in the infallibility of the Biblical writings shaken, the divorce from the traditional creed seldom involved any repudiation of natural religion. Passing into the ranks of the Free-thinkers, the sceptic as to Revelation might and generally did remain a firm adherent to the belief in a God and a Divine government. If Locke's arguments for the Reasonableness of Christianity were pronounced unsatisfactory, the Essay on the Human Understanding still provided an independent basis for an assurance respecting the existence of an Omniscient, Omnipotent and Providential Deity.

In the present day, however, the dominant philosophy is by no means so ready to come to the relief of the perplexed and dissatisfied student of Christian evidences, as it was in the days when Christianity and Deism divided between them the allegiance of men of thought. The doubtful inquirer, whom the eloquence of Spurgeon cannot fascinate, nor the logic of Mansel enchain, will now, we fear, find little reinforcement for his failing faith in the teachings of those philosophers, whose wisdom our daily newspapers delight to reflect, and who congratulate each other on having "re-conquered for this island the sceptre of psychology." Yet this popular experience-philosophy,—to which Mr. J. S. Mill has devoted his vigorous thought and clear and graceful diction, which Mr. Bain has enriched with many valuable observations on the physiological accompaniments of mind, and which the historian of Greece adorned with the charms of learning and genius,—cannot but be regarded as the legitimate descendant of that philosophy of the 18th century which was so favourable to Deistic belief. Its disciples

trace back its genealogy through J. S. Mill to James Mill, thence to Hartley and Hume; and this brings us into close connection with the system of Locke, Bishop Berkeley's Idealism furnishing an unintended stepping-stone. How comes it, then, that a philosophy, which in its origin was a bulwark both to natural and revealed religion, has become in its developed form the most formidable stronghold of scepticism and negation? Before we attempt to answer this question, let us consider whether it be true that Sensationalism is so unfavourable to religious belief; for we may be reminded that Mr. Mill, in his candidature for a seat in Parliament, received high clerical testimony to the soundness of his Theism; while as to Mr. Bain, his Calvinistic admirers find his Necessarianism a valuable ally in theological controversy, and apparently regard his attitude to the orthodox Confession of Faith as at least a friendly neutrality. We will, accordingly, inquire what relation Mr. Mill himself seeks to establish between his philosophical views and the belief in God's being and character.

After having resolved the human mind into a series of sensations, supplemented by believed possibilities of sensation, he endeavours to shew that, among the group of sensations constituting one's-self, some bear evidence of being connected with other threads of consciousness, forming other minds; so that though we have no reason to believe in an external world, yet we have proof that there do exist other series of conscious states beside our own. It seems to us, however, that when Mr. Mill denies that our mental states give us any knowledge of "outness," he deprives himself of the right of passing beyond the subjective sphere, of making assertions respecting existences other than himself; and we believe that Dr. M'Cosh's statement is correct when he says: "Mr. Mill must, I suspect, either logically remain for ever within the sphere of the Ego, with possibilities he knows not what; or if he once go beyond it, he must include not only other minds, but material objects following laws independent of our subjective constitution or perceptions." Mr. Mill, however, who never allows any theory to carry him very far from the track of common sense, stoutly maintains that his doctrine does furnish a basis for the firm conviction that other minds exist; and then proceeds to make provision for a possible belief in God:

"As the theory leaves the evidence of the existence of my fellow-creatures exactly as it was before, so does it also with that of the existence of God. Supposing me to believe that the Divine Mind is simply the series of the Divine thoughts and feelings prolonged through eternity, that would be, at any rate, believing God's existence to be as real as my own. And as for evidence, the argument of Paley's Natural Theology, or, for that matter, of his Evidences of Christianity, would stand exactly where it does. The Design argument is drawn from the analogy of human experience. From the relation which human works bear to human thoughts and feelings, it infers a corresponding relation between works, more or less similar but superhuman, and superhuman thoughts and feelings. If it proves these, nobody but a metaphysician needs care whether or not it proves a mysterious substratum for them. Again, the arguments for Revelation undertake to prove by testimony, that within the sphere of human experience works were done requiring a greater than human power, and words said requiring a greater than human wisdom. These positions, and the evidences of them, neither lose nor gain anything by our supposing that the wisdom only means wise thoughts and volitions, and that the power means thoughts and volitions followed by imposing phenomena."*

From this quotation it is clear that, even if Mr. Mill's philosophy does afford a logical passage beyond the subjective region (which we question), it still leaves him with only one possible line of approach to theological truth, namely, the argument from Design. Now this argument is undoubtedly most interesting and confirmative to those who on other grounds have come to recognize an Intelligent Will† as the cause of phenomena; but, as Professor Mar-

---

* Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy, p. 210.

† See the Contemporary Review, July 1870, article viii., "Is there any 'Axiom of Causality'?" by the Rev. James Martineau. In this brief but profound paper, the fundamental principle of Mr. Martineau's philosophy (to wit, the equivalence of the ideas of Cause and Will) is established by a line of exposition and argument which, we believe, will be found equally satisfactory to the most scrupulous psychologist, and to the subtile analyst of mental conceptions. On comparing Mr. Martineau's doctrine of Causation with Sir William Hamilton's, it is interesting to observe how entirely the former remains unaffected by Mr. Mill's criticism. The same may be said of several other skirmishes in this battle of the philosophics, in which Sensationalism appears to have carried off an easy victory. The triumphant flourish, for example, with which Mr. Mill signalizes his demolition of the sophistical web which Mr. Mansel had woven to veil from view the moral character of God, would never have given vivacity to his page, had Mr. Martineau been singled out as the champion of the Intuitional cause. On this question the rival chieftains

tineau has clearly shewn, it is utterly incompetent to form a basis of theistic belief. The philosopher who has recourse to the observation of nature alone, and carries thither no intuition of a Deity believed in on independent grounds, will bring back from physical investigation neither a richer nor a firmer faith than that with which he entered on his task. No questioning of the outer world can give aught else than a knowledge of the order according to which phenomena invariably succeed each other; and, surely, the natural effect of such discoveries on the student who does not bring with him the conviction that all phenomena, whether regular or apparently irregular, are equally the outcome and evidence of the activity of Thought and Will, is neither more nor less than to erase for him the traces of purpose and design from the pages of creation, and to leave no record there save of unintelligent order and of unmoral force. Science asks and receives no other explanation than such as discovered law can furnish, and her goal is reached in proportion as she has shewn that every phenomenon of nature presents no other features than such as coincide with those uniform sequences which form the object of inductive research. With what success she is working towards the realization of this end,—how surely the realm of law is extending over not only the inorganic, but also the vegetable and animal kingdom,—no reader of recent works on science can fail to perceive. There can be no question, we think, that if it be true, as Mr. Mill holds, that we have no intelligent access to the causes of phenomena, and have reason to rest satisfied with the knowledge of their orderly sequences, then every extension of scientific explanation renders less necessary the hypothesis of a God; and the Evolution doctrine, as its makes good its position, inevitably banishes the teleological argument to the limbo

---

would, then, have found themselves fighting on the self-same side, since from no quarter has this nescience theory, whether as elaborated by Mr. Mansel or by Mr. H. Spencer, received a more fatal blow than from Mr. Martineau's own pen. And, in general, we believe that wherever spiritual philosophy appears to have received some serious detriment from Mr. Mill's assault, the damage has been done, not to any essential portion of the fabric, but merely to some accidental outwork, thrown up by Sir William Hamilton as a brilliant eccentricity, or else as a defence of his mighty but futile efforts to reconcile the negative elements of Kant's metaphysics with the positive principles of cognition which Reid and Stewart maintained.

of exploded theories. But if it be true, on the other hand, as we believe consciousness emphatically declares it to be, that the soul cannot rest satisfied with the mere knowledge of before and after in the events of nature, but importunately calls for an adequate cause for these events and their mutual relations, we are next led to ask, whether there is any provision in the constitution of the mind of man for the satisfaction of this irrepressible demand. We feel assured that such provision is made; we have not here an exceptional anomaly—the presence of spiritual hunger and thirst, and yet no bread of life, no living water. For while the consciousness of our own volitions assures us that only the activity of conscious Will can be a sufficient explanation of what we perceive around us, at the same time the influence of God's Spirit upon our spirit reveals the thought of Him as an Omnipotent Personality, whose presence with us is fully adequate to account for the totality of nature's wonders. And now we enter upon the study of the outer universe with the key to the solution of its deepest problem already in our hands. What science is satisfied to call laws, are now seen to be modes of Divine volition; and whereas, when biassed by the sway of an unspiritual philosophy, men have been wont to look for signs of God's activity only amid phenomena that could not be brought under the range of well-understood sequence, now, the theistic believer, seeing the true meaning of the sublime doctrine of Evolution, needs no longer hunt for vestiges of Deity in the rare and the seemingly exceptional, but recognizes His presence and His handiwork everywhere, as much along the far-stretching paths of astronomical and geological development, as in the intricate mysteries of the instinct of the bee or the marvellous structure of the brain. Carrying into our observation of nature a firm conviction, based on *à-priori* grounds, that Mind is ever active there, we recognize with grateful joy the frequent confirmations of our faith which so many obvious marks of design in creation lavishly supply. And when we come to other fields of physical research, where such conspicuous marks of benevolent intention do not meet our gaze, where the lines of God's activity converge towards a point too far removed for our finite ken to discern the end in view, yet none the less does well-grounded faith give firm assurance

of intelligent volition there. And as the conscience and the pure affections come, each with its own special insight, to the reason's aid, the spiritual vision becomes more complete, and to the devout and adoring soul there remains no blank spot in creation unhallowed by the sacred presence of a Wise Mind and of a Loving Heart.

If we are now told that "Wonder is only the daughter of Ignorance," that the discovery of universal laws is disenchanting the admiring reverence with which we gaze on the unexplained and apparently inexplicable, we reply that, to the thoughtful Theist, the sentiment of wonder, so far from being dissipated, is surely intensified; the change is simply in its being transferred to a worthier object; no longer dwelling on the outward phenomena, it passes from "nature up to nature's God," and adores the Omnipresent Spirit, who, while beneficently conforming His activity to those uniform modes which render human science and moral discipline possible, can yet so choose and exert these manifestations of power, that in their grand concurrence they give birth to this unspeakably beautiful and harmonious universe. "How precious are thy thoughts unto me, O God! how great is the sum of them!" exclaims the true philosopher, as he welcomes each fresh generalization of science which gives greater freedom to his intellect, sublimer conceptions to his faith.

Thus we see that the teleological argument, when held in conjunction with a philosophy which recognizes as legitimate the search for causes, and finds the satisfying object of that search in an ever-present Will, meets in the Evolution theory no refutation, but rather a healthful, liberating process, which sets it free from the confined areas in which alone it was once exercised, and gives it the *entrée* to the whole realm of scientific truth. If Paley and the Bridgwater Treatises are less read than formerly, it is not because their illustrations have lost their interest, but because a truer spiritual philosophy is making every book of science a contribution to natural theology. Superficially regarded, no doubt, the Darwinian theory does seem to dim our perception of God in nature; but in this, as in all previous cases where science and faith have come into apparent collision, the result will be to give to spiritual discernment greater clearness and a wider range; and we shall see here

also one more of the many verifications of Francis Bacon's prophetic words: "It is true that a little philosophy inclineth man's mind to atheism; but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion; for while the mind of man looketh upon second causes scattered, it may sometimes rest in them, and go no farther; but when it beholdeth the chain of them confederate and linked together, it must needs fly to Providence and Deity."

While, then, claiming for the Intuitional philosophy the right not only to use the argument from Design, but to vastly extend its application, we must still repeat that the Experiential philosophy, by the very nature of its primary assumptions, precludes itself from making use of the only mode of demonstration through which it professes to find a possible way to the knowledge of God. Mr. Mill, by assigning our conception of causal power to the laws of association rather than to the consciousness of personal origination, has, we have seen, undermined the only foundation on which an impregnable fortress of Natural Theology can be erected; and we must further add that, by his resolution of duty into calculations of expediency, he misses the essential idea of obligation, and so, depriving the categorical imperative of its objective and authoritative character, discredits the most reliable witness that testifies to man of a kingdom not of this world. It is not surprising, then, that with no other access to the knowledge of God than by an argument alien to his philosophy, and with no other conception of Him than as a series of loose states of consciousness united by no substantial and causal bond, he should speak of Him in the hypothetical mood, and should inform us, as he does in his account of Comte's philosophy, that he sees no glaring incongruity in the idea of a religion which should dispense with His existence.

It seems clear also, that even if Mr. Mill should succeed in shewing that a belief in a Supreme Personality is compatible with his system of thought, yet his account of the human mind is so defective, that he declares closed those moral and spiritual avenues through which alone his disciples could arrive at any satisfying consciousness on this matter. Personally he may have a firm faith in God, but it is probable that his belief has other and surer foundations than any of which his philosophy takes account. It is our

good fortune, in the present day, to have outgrown the error of confounding intellectual speculations about God, with the real relation* (conscious or otherwise) of the soul to God. Sound philosophizing is doubtless a precious and health-giving blessing to the mind, and false philosophizing a serious calamity, yet, beyond a question, there are cases where a man's intellectual theory may seem to remove God indefinitely from him, while a clear conscience and a pure and loving heart may qualify his soul for daily enrichment from God's near presence and sympathy. Two distinct qualifications appear to be required for the clear apprehension and imparting of theological truth. There is needed, primarily, that intensity of moral earnestness and that strength and purity of the affections which are at once the conditions and the sign of God's incarnation in the soul, and bring with them the pervading consciousness of a Holy Presence. But if this feeling is to translate itself into thought, to become a religious doctrine clearly conceived and firmly held, it is further necessary that the understanding should be freed from all tyrannous misconceptions, which preclude or distort the intellectual cognizance of spiritual truth. Unhappily, in this country, the too exclusive attention given to the study of science, and the too engrossing interest taken in material enterprizes of every kind, have not only dulled the spiritual perception of those divine realities which lie on the inner side of human life, but have so prepossessed the reason with the axioms and methods applicable only to physical discovery, that many have become intellectually incapable of dealing fairly with those data of consciousness, which arise out of our relation to an unseen world. In vain does the clear voice of conscience daily repeat its authoritative tones, and invitations to the joys of a diviner life reveal to the soul the presence of the All-loving One, if the reason has become incapable of truly interpreting this spiritual consciousness, and, forcing it into the moulds of scientific conception, deprives it of its living spirit and essential meaning, leaving nothing but a verbal corpse, which metaphysical ingenuity quickly resolves into its sensational elements. As long as the ideas

---

* See, on this subject, Mr. R. H. Hutton's "Theological Essays," for the testimony of one who appears to combine in an unusual degree intellectual with spiritual discernment in his view of this question.

generated by exclusive attention to the outer world, so completely pre-occupy and fetter the understanding as to compel it to interpret causation as mere invariable antecedence, volitions as the mechanical resultants of competing motives, conscience as the product of estimates of pleasure, it is only too certain that the revelation of things divine which visits the soul from within through the open doors of Love and Duty, will never blend in one harmonious conviction with these dogmas of an incomplete and one-sided philosophy. Yet, as we have noticed, the intellectual inability to admit spiritual truth which springs from the imperfect culture or hereditary bias of the understanding, may co-exist with a condition of heart and character very favourable to spiritual discernment. And, as this latter is the essential and living principle both in religious life and in religious belief, to which, if it be faithfully maintained and cherished, the conceptions of the understanding will in the long run conform themselves, we hail with joy the evidence which we derive from the writings of Auguste Comte and J. S. Mill, and several others of the same mental family, that this Positivist philosophy, which we think so obstructive to theological conviction, is yet accompanied with moral affections and spiritual aspirations of a very high and pure kind. Far more encouraging to the student of religious belief is this earnest doubt, accompanied with practical adherence to a lofty ethical idea, than that intellectual assent to Deistic ideas, combined with spiritual deadness, which too much characterized such Deists as Bolingbroke and Voltaire.

This comparison of the Sceptic of the 19th with the Deist of the 18th century, while it shews us that the present prospects of religious conviction are not so utterly gloomy as we at first were led to fear they were, at the same time reminds us of the question which we put to ourselves at the opening of this article, and for the answer to which the estimate we have just attempted of the theological value of the present experience-philosophy, was intended to pave the way. We have endeavoured to make clear that this philosophy in its present shape provides no mode of approach to the knowledge of God, and now we wish to know how it is that recent Sensationalists seem to differ in this respect from the Free-thinkers of the last cen-

tury, who, though in the same line of philosophical descent, yet held firmly to theistic ideas. Is not the true explanation to be found in the fact that Locke instituted an entirely false conception as to the channel through which religious knowledge enters the soul, and also of the influences which favour or retard the growth of this higher wisdom? If so, it will not be difficult to see how a fundamental misdirection may have led to a divergence from truth and reality, which is exhibited far more clearly in his later than in his earlier followers. The fruits, beneficial or mischievous, of a philosophical principle are often long in fully ripening. We are aware that there exists great difference of opinion as to how far Locke's association of reflection with sensation as a source of ideas, relieves his theory from being responsible for the extreme results of French and English Sensationalism. We do not think that Locke contemplated the having among his ideas of reflection any ideas which we call *à priori*, yet it is certainly true that he held (whether consistently with his principles or not, may be doubted) that we derive the idea of power from the exercise of our own volitions; for he says, "If we will consider it attentively, bodies, by our senses, do not afford us so clear and distinct an idea of active power, as we have from reflection on the operations of our minds." In this way, he, of course, introduces an idea which is not derived from any reflection on the operation of mind in its dealings with sensation, but is born of the mind's free activity; and it is the perception of this psychological truth which widely removes him from the position of Hume and the Mills, and enables him intellectually to reach the theistic idea that everything material must take its origin in that which is not material, but cogitative or spiritual. Yet in his philosophy this theological idea found no congenial soil; it is barren in results, and brings in its train but few of those inspiring conceptions of God and our spiritual relation to Him, which alone satisfy the cravings of an awakened soul, and furnish the matter of a true philosophy of religion. Indeed, it is difficult to believe that Locke possessed any firm hold on this intuitional argument for the existence of God; for had he clearly seen that everything phenomenal must needs be referred to a mental cause, he would hardly have been guilty of the preposterous

logic of maintaining, in opposition to Bishop Stillingfleet and in conformity with Professor Huxley, that it is conceivable that God should confer on matter the power of thinking and willing. For let us try to conceive of matter thinking, and we shall find ourselves by a mental necessity converting its imagined atoms into a crowded gathering of minds that think and will, and thus we annihilate in our conception all that is material, in the vain effort to clothe it with incompatible attributes.

Cousin's* somewhat severe criticism of this philosophy appears, then, to be in the main just; the Intuitionalism in it is rather accidental than essential, the Sensationalism is its characteristic and formative principle. Locke's theology, accordingly, practically has its root in, and draws its nourishment from, observation of the facts presented to the senses, and does not rest upon the consciousness of the direct influence of God upon the soul. Hence is it that, in the case of almost all the *à-priori ideas* (such as those of personal identity, of infinity, of eternity, of moral judgment) which arise in the soul from contact with and participation in a spiritual life, his psychological account does but mock the inquirer, giving us instead the history of some accompanying facts of sensation, and leaving us quite in the dark respecting the very feature in the mental state in which we are most interested, and the meaning of which we wish to fathom. And where, as in dealing with the idea of power, he has seized the right psychological clue, his followers, observing rather the spirit of his philosophy than its historical shape, eagerly cast it away as a misleading conception, with which he and they have nothing to do.

Hence is it, also, that his doctrine of Revelation is (as

---

* Consult, however, Mr. Martineau's review of "Morell's History of Modern Philosophy," where evidence is adduced to shew that our English philosopher has on some points met with unfair treatment at the hands of his brilliant critic. Cousin, with the swiftly generalizing instinct of his nation, deals rather with what he feels to be the necessary logical outcome of this philosophy than with its actual historical form. The consequence is, that he does not take sufficient account of the clear recognition by Locke of many important facts of consciousness which have since been ignored or distorted by the experience school; nor, in general, does he discriminate between the conscientious carefulness which marks Locke's inventory of our mental furniture, and the limping logic by which he tries to shew how it may all have come into our possession, though no other door save that of sensation had ever been opened.

it seems to us) so utterly unsatisfactory, false and mischievous. Instead of recognizing a constant action of the Divine Spirit on humanity,—daily illuminating us with the light of reason, adding authority to our moral judgments, giving to our affections their purity and warmth, and in holier minds in their holiest moods affording the highest privilege of conscious personal communion,—our author, on the contrary, emphatically declines to listen to those (beyond the Biblical limits) who claim to use at first hand that spiritual discernment which Paul regards as the divinest faculty of saintly minds. How entirely Locke's mental bias incapacitated him for understanding and appreciating any of the more marked and precious experiences of the religious life, will appear from the following extract taken out of his Journal:

"Sunday, February 19th, 1682. A strong and firm persuasion of any proposition relating to religion, for which a man hath either no, or not sufficient, proofs from reason, but receives them as truths wrought in the mind extraordinarily by influence coming immediately from God himself, seems to me to be enthusiasm, which can be no evidence or ground of assurance at all, nor can by any means be taken for knowledge."

No doubt there was some justification for this wholesale distrust of all enthusiastic announcements of personal revelation, for the 17th century had witnessed many startling and revolting fanaticisms, in which a small leaven of spiritual life and insight gave a brief vitality to very grotesque forms of intellectual error. Locke very properly wishes to apply a test to the utterances of those who claim to see by an inward light; and did he use a fair criterion, there would be nothing to object to in his method. Instead of so doing, however, he commits the serious error of trying the deliverances of one faculty of the soul by appealing to the testimony of a quite different one, as though we were to discredit the reality of sweet sounds, because, forsooth, the eye-sight could tell us nothing about them. How he deals with the enthusiast who feels that God has put some religious truth into his heart, which shines by its own light and brings with it its own authority, may be fairly set forth as follows. He inquires, "Is what you have to tell me such as I can find out for myself by my own reason, or can gather from Scripture? if so, your pretended illu-

nination is superfluous. Secondly, if it is such as I cannot of myself discover, is it conformable to reason, though not demonstrable by reason? if your answer is in the affirmative, I am willing to listen to what you have to say, and I patiently wait for the exhibition of your credentials, on the strength of which I am asked to accept your teaching as God's truth." But we shall better arrive at the true character of this method by picturing to ourselves a concrete example of it. We will take, for instance, the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. It will probably be admitted that to many minds, in a certain state of culture and in their more spiritual moods, this doctrine comes home with self-evidencing clearness; and besides, there are exceptional natures so richly visited by influences from the unseen world, that doubt is to them impossible; sceptical arguments, physical or metaphysical, affect them not; they cannot refute your logic perchance, nor do they care to do so; they have in their heavenward affections a directness of vision which renders all inferential reasoning needless and inappropriate. Now history informs us that between the close of the canonical Jewish Scriptures and the birth of Christ, this belief had gradually taken more definite shape and firmer root in the more devout minds of the Hebrew race—so much so, that from the faint adumbration of it which appears in Job and the Psalms, it had become, at the commencement of our era, a well-marked conviction with a large section of the people. Suppose that during this transition state some gifted man, in whom this revelation of the deathless nature of the soul was a very vivid fact, meets a philosopher of the intellectual type to which John Locke belongs, and our sage hears the seer's impassioned proclamation of man's immortal destiny. The philosopher is interested by the assertion, for it concerns a subject on which his reason has often exercised itself, but has never succeeded in passing beyond the borders of probability into the region of conclusive certainty. Here is a case, then, in which an enthusiast professes to know by spiritual discernment a truth which transcends the demonstrative powers of the reason. The sage cannot satisfy himself fully either about the immateriality or the immortality of the soul, and here is one who declares in tones of authority that man is an immortal spirit. His two pre-

liminary questions are thus answered to his satisfaction; the prophet announces something which the unaided reason cannot fully establish, but which is, at the same time, perfectly conformable with what reason can make good. Eagerly the philosopher calls for the enthusiast's testimonials; he trusts that he is on the point of making an important addition to his store of well-authenticated truths. Alas for the vanity of human wishes! The seer can only repeat with impatient emphasis, "There is a voice in my soul, to which I cannot choose but listen, proclaiming what I say to be eternal truth. Is there no echoing response in you too, O philosopher! confirming the heavenly message which I so clearly hear?" "Is this all the evidence you have to lay before me?" the disappointed man of reason replies; "think you that I will be a sharer in your self-delusion? Shall I confound my wishes and fancies and presentiments with conclusively proved or well-accredited knowledge? No! I pity you, and I must leave you. You are a mistaken enthusiast. Yet, stay; before we separate, tell me distinctly, has any wonderful work been wrought to prove this teaching to be Divine?" It is an age, perchance, when miracles are rare. The prophet can appeal to none other than the mighty power of the message to awaken new life and energy within his breast, to cause the germination of diviner affections, the building up of a holier character, in the souls of those who have willingly received the glad tidings that he brings. The philosopher returns in sadness to his study, little dreaming that there may be an Organon of Spiritual Discovery (broadly outlined in the words of Jesus, "The pure in heart shall see God"), which is of a different kind, indeed, but certainly not less reliable, not less fruitful in resultant wisdom, than are those which Aristotle and Bacon have expounded with respect to truths of intellectual discernment.

That we have not in the least caricatured Locke's doctrine concerning Revelation will, we think, be evident from the following extract, which we select from the Essay on the Human Understanding:

"*Belief no proof of Revelation.*—If this internal light, or any proposition which under that title we take for inspired, be conformable to the principles of reason, or to the word of God, which is attested revelation, reason warrants it, and we may

safely receive it for true, and be guided by it in our belief and actions; if it receive no testimony nor evidence from either of these rules, we cannot take it for a revelation, or so much as for true, till we have some other mark that it is a revelation besides our believing that it is so. Thus we see the holy men of old, who had revelations from God, had something else besides that internal light of assurance in their own minds, to testify to them that it was from God. They were not left to their own persuasions alone, that those persuasions were from God, but had outward signs to convince them of the Author of those revelations. And when they were to convince others, they had a power given them to justify the truth of their commission from heaven, and by visible signs to assert the divine authority of a message they were sent with. Moses saw the bush burn without being consumed, and heard a voice out of it. This was something besides finding an impulse upon his mind to go to Pharaoh, that he might bring his brethren out of Egypt; and yet he thought not this enough to authorize him to go with that message, till God, by another miracle of his rod turned into a serpent, had assured him of a power to testify his mission, by the same miracle repeated before them whom he was sent to. Gideon was sent by an angel to deliver Israel from the Midianites, and yet he desired a sign to convince him that this commission was from God. These, and several the like instances to be found among the prophets of old, are enough to shew that they thought not an inward seeing or persuasion of their own minds a sufficient evidence that it was from God; though the Scripture does not everywhere mention their demanding or having such proofs."*

It would seem to be a sufficient *reductio ad absurdum* of this theory to hint that, if it be true, such teachers as John the Baptist would be of doubtful authority, since he seems both to have accepted his own commission on evidence that would by no means have satisfied our philosopher, and to have taught others without the indispensable accompaniments of outward and visible signs; again, the confirmatory testimony of heathen seers, such as Socrates, to matters of Christian faith would be almost valueless, for the *δαίμων* appears to have given no outward manifestations; and, finally, our only possible chance of adding to the treasures of revealed truth in modern times would seem to be by attendance at the *séances* of spiritualistic mediums. It

* Book iv. ch. xix. § 15.

is in no scoffing spirit that we say this; we say it, even at the risk of being thought irreverent, because we deeply feel the great importance of placing in as strong a light as possible the true nature of this method of testing spiritual truth, which, glorified by the genius and high character of John Locke, has now for more than a century and a half exercised an influence (not devoid of harm) upon religious philosophy and theological ideas. The utter incompetency of this system of thought to deal fairly with those facts of human nature which arise on that inner side of our being where we are farthest from the phenomenal and nearest to the real, will be still more clearly manifest if we throw upon the subject the light of contrast; and, for that purpose, we will ask the reader's permission to lay before him the view of Revelation presented by R. W. Emerson in that wonderful essay on the Over-soul, which, though betraying, as we think, too faint a sense of the Personality of God, is yet most rich in profound and fertile ideas to the student of spiritual wisdom:

"We distinguish the announcements of the soul, its manifestations of its own nature, by the term *Revelation*. These are always attended by the emotion of the sublime. For this communication is an influx of the Divine Mind into our mind. It is an ebb of the individual rivulet before the flowing surges of the sea of life. Every distinct apprehension of this central commandment agitates men with awe and delight. A thrill passes through all men at the reception of new truth, or at the performance of a great action, which comes out of the heart of nature. In these communications, the power to see is not separated from the will to do, but the insight proceeds from obedience, and the obedience proceeds from a joyful perception. Every moment when the individual feels himself invaded by it is memorable. Always, I believe, by the necessity of our constitution, a certain enthusiasm attends the individual's consciousness of that Divine presence. The character and duration of this enthusiasm varies with the state of the individual, from an ecstacy and trance and prophetic inspiration—which is its rarer appearance—to the faintest glow of virtuous emotion, in which form it warms, like our household fires, all the families and associations of men, and makes society possible. A certain tendency to insanity has always attended the opening of the religious sense in men, as if 'blasted by excess of light.' The trances of Socrates, the 'union' of Plotinus, the vision of Porphyry, the conversion

of Paul, the aurora of Behmen, the convulsions of George Fox and his Quakers, the illumination of Swedenborg, are of this kind. What was in the case of these remarkable persons a ravishment, has, in innumerable instances in common life, been exhibited in less striking manner. Everywhere the history of religion betrays a tendency to enthusiasm. The rapture of the Moravian and Quietest; the opening of the internal sense of the Word, in the language of the New Jerusalem church; the revival of the Calvinistic churches; the experiences of the Methodists, —are varying forms of that shudder of awe and delight with which the individual soul always mingles with the universal soul."

Were we to try by Locke's standard the religious phenomena here enumerated, they would all, it would seem (with the exception of the conversion of Paul), have to be rejected *en masse* as mischievous "enthusiasms," testifying to no spiritual realities, and disturbing that calm exercise of the reason, and that cautious weighing of the external evidences, which, according to the axioms of this school, form the indispensable conditions of all well-grounded faith. Are we, then, to suppose that Locke's genuine acceptance of Christian truth was really based on his own principles, that it rested on the persuasion that the mighty works associated with the utterances in the Bible are so well authenticated as to justify firm confidence in the heavenly mission of those who gave them forth? By no means can we believe this; an intellect keen and critical, like Locke's, would never have deemed the evidence for Biblical miracles sufficiently conclusive, had he not exercised, though without clearly recognizing it, that spiritual discernment which theoretically he so much distrusted, and, seeing by an inward light the teachings to be Divine, eagerly admitted, without too close a scrutiny, that objective confirmation, which enabled him to harmonize to his own satisfaction the truths congenial to his heart and conscience, with the grounds of certitude laid down by his philosophy. And, indeed, there were special features in the revelation given in the New Testament which would tend to subdue Locke's habitual repugnance to religious excitement. In passing into the pure and prayerful heart of Jesus of Nazareth (and the same is, to a large extent, true of the apostle Paul), the inspiring influence from God, meeting with no personal

obstructions, no confirmed prejudices, no strength of worldly habits, benignly diffused itself through the life of the Beloved Son, without disturbance of the intellect, without any dislocation of the moral judgment, and entered, like gentle vivifying sunlight, into the hearts of willing listeners, awakening in many minds a new principle of life and energy, a formative power, which sometimes displayed itself in transfiguring and sanctifying the general thought and character,—at other times, upheaving the dead weight of prejudice and evil custom, convulsed the soul as with an earthquake's shock, and occasioned all those remarkable instances of transient mental and even moral confusion which Paul saw to be owing to the working of the Spirit, yet wisely sought to calm and regulate. To John Locke's earnest and devout soul, there was much in the Christian revelation which was most congenial, much in the calm, deep wisdom of Jesus and of Paul which satisfied his aspirations, while it did not repel his reason; and hence it came to pass that, with a beneficent and noble inconsistency, he exempted the purest, the most unalloyed of all divine enthusiasms from the sweeping condemnation which he passed upon the rest; and, by thus allying his teaching (in however illogical and unnatural a mode) with vital and eternal truth, saved, we think, his philosophical system from the degradation and collapse to which its intrinsic qualities would soon have hurried it. We believe, then, that Locke's embrace of the truths of religion was really, though unconsciously to himself, due to the operation of that spiritual faculty which he disowned, that true and inward "Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." Had he intellectually recognized this perceptive power of the conscience and the affections, when acted upon by the Divine Spirit, to see and grasp the truths which concern man's eternal life, he would have tested "revelations" by their power to kindle and to satisfy the aspirations of his purest and holiest moods, and would have used the reason as that indispensable but negative criterion whereby we detect the earthly alloy in this heavenly treasure, and are enabled to clear away the sensational accretions, and to rectify the intellectual distortions, with which the glad tidings from the heavenly land issue at times from the mouths of their human exponents. If this faculty of

spiritual insight had been duly acknowledged, its most precious and special revelations fairly tested and reverently received, and those intuitional ideas which shine by their own light clearly discriminated from all sensational knowledge, we should have had a philosophy which would have made some approach to "an analysis of the phenomena of the human mind,"—a philosophy which would recognize and see a reason for the irresistible energy of religious faith, which would embrace ideas and truths theological as well as intellectual, would trace them both to modes of God's action on the soul, would shew their harmony, their mutual relations, the necessity of their concurrence in all true wisdom. Such a philosophy would guard its votaries against the neglect of any faculty which gives access to God's truth. It would utter an earnest protest against that engrossing attention to the outward and the temporal which disqualifies the understanding for interpreting the messages from the eternal world, and renders us deaf to those diviner voices which alone can solve the anxious problems of the soul, and whisper sweetest consolation from within, when all without is sad and dark. And while it thus vindicated the claims of the spiritual side of humanity, it would none the less do justice to culture and to intellect, would shew the danger of absorption in devout sentiment, would stimulate mental and social activity, and point out how, without such co-operation, religious feeling cannot do its perfect work, cannot shape for itself clear and growing conceptions, and is wont to lapse either into vague and passive mysticism, with no distinct apprehension of Him whom we adore, or into bigoted fanaticism, with its fierce and unholy passions, and its hard and contracted ideas. Such is a rude sketch of what we conceive to be involved in a complete philosophy of the human mind, a philosophy which must needs be wedded to theology by bonds as natural as they are sacred and indissoluble, seeing that the true philosopher cannot but acknowledge with joyful gratitude his constant illumination from that inner world, whence come also those messages and those invitations, to the full interpretation of which it is the theologian's special function to aid his fellowmen.

That any other relation than this between philosophy and theology cruelly wrongs and injures both, we feel fully

assured; and, as additional proof of this, we will, in conclusion, give a glance at the effects produced by Locke's unhappy severance of this natural union.

As the experience-philosophy can of itself furnish no sure basis for religious faith, nor can apply any but external tests to the faith of others, it follows that when it does accept an historical religion, it accepts it simply as well-attested documentary evidence of certain true propositions concerning the Deity and the soul; and its disciples scrupulously avoid cherishing those warm and enthusiastic emotions towards God and heavenly realities which sacred writings are fitted to inspire; hence missing the most precious benefit which traditional revelation can confer, and entering not into the true spirit of the teachers whom they trust. Therefore is it that such a belief in the Bible as Locke and his religious followers have possessed, has never been a living, self-propagating impulse. The views of God and immortality thus gained have served to neutralize the speculative ill effects of an imperfect philosophy, and to save the conscience from the paralyzing effects of Necessarian metaphysics and Utilitarian ethics; but this is almost all that we can say. And if we try to estimate fairly what are the fruits of this unnatural relationship of philosophy and faith, must we not say that it has produced virtuous lives devoid of enthusiasm, works of erudition devoid of the fire of genius, Christian evidences devoid of Christianity, moral essays in place of spiritual announcements, rational and amiable complacency instead of the diviner unrest of an awakened soul? So much for religious Lockists; and yet it has fared far better with these than with their free-thinking brethren, who took the philosophy and left the faith. For the former, having satisfied their intellect that in the Hebraic and Christian Scriptures there is well-accredited and unique information on important matters that transcend the reason, have of course studied these writings with reverential care; and, as they contain records of the deepest and most real religious experiences of mankind, such students have caught enough of reflected light and heat to save their spiritual nature from starvation and decay, though not enough to enable them to propagate any intense thrill of vitality through other hearts and lives. Deism, on the other hand, had no such nourishment and strength from the reflected

faith of diviner souls; as a religious system, after a vain attempt to substitute intellectual brilliancy for spiritual insight, it rapidly deteriorated and decayed; and its intellectual progeny will be found among the Secularists of to-day, with Mr. Holyoake as the representative of whatever positive elements of faith it still retains, and Mr. Bradlaugh of its negative and destructive criticism. They are but an illustration of the truth of Sir William Hamilton's words, "that we must recognize a God from our own minds before we can detect a God in the universe of nature." The inevitable development of any system of religious doctrine which denies that God reveals Himself directly to man in the intuitions of duty and affection, is to pass rapidly from a faith into a philosophy, and then from a philosophy about a God to a philosophy that rejects a God. And if we consider the purely intellectual development of Locke's philosophy, in men who separated it from the first from all questions of natural theology, we shall find here, too, that the last state of such a system is even worse than the first. For, unconsciously, the Sensationalist at the outset takes up into his doctrine certain supersensual ideas (as those of causal power and of moral obligation),—ideas born of our communion with the spiritual world, and in no way imported through any channel of sensation. Such conceptions serve at first to lend a coherence and vitality to the system; but the logical and consistent theorist soon discovers that they have no business there, and diligently sets to work, either, as Comte does, to eliminate them altogether as metaphysical intruders, or else exhausts his ingenuity in trying to shew that, though at the first glance they may have quite an ontological look about them, they are nothing, after all, but our old friends the sensations, with whom the association of ideas has been playing strange games, and has disguised them beyond all power of recognition by a curious sort of psychological chemistry. This latter procedure is the favourite one in this country, and it may be seen richly exemplified in the book by James Mill whose title heads this article; to the re-publication of which, his son, aided by Mr. Bain and Mr. Grote, has attached corrective notes, so as to make it a useful manifesto of the present attitude and claims of this school of philosophy.

After thus recounting the natural products (philosophical

and theological) of Lockian modes of conception and method, we must not omit to refer, though very briefly, to the parallel development in late years of a different philosophical spirit, and of what we consider to be a healthier view of the relations of faith and knowledge. The next generation to John Locke's saw the publication of Bishop Butler's "Sermons on Human Nature," which instituted an entirely different and, as we think, a truer reading of the facts of consciousness, and gave the first outlines of a sound psychology. By making clear a difference of moral rank among our springs of action, and assigning to conscience a natural supremacy, an inherent divine authority, Butler vindicated the native presence in the soul of man of inspirations from on high; and, though he knew it not, as his Analogy painfully testifies, yet he really suggested the repeal of the unnatural divorce between reason and revelation, and gave a nobler direction both to speculation and to faith. The key-note of truth being thus sounded in this country, Kant, later on in Germany, struck it with a still firmer hand, and, emphatically announcing the unearthly character and deep significance of the moral sentiment, gave a new principle of life to thought and to theology, which not only has already produced a rich harvest in its native land, but entering this country, through such teachers as Coleridge and Wordsworth, has blended, not without mutual advantage, with the better influences of the old English school, and has given to us such philosophers as Reid and Hamilton and Martineau, such soul-stirring preachers as Robertson, and a noble few among our literary men who, caring less for popularity than for truth, faithfully testify to the Real and the Eternal, amid a multitude all too intent on knowing and enjoying the illusive shows of transient appearance. Nor has this spiritual impulse been confined to England and to Germany; in France it has inspired such philosophers as Jouffroy and Janet, such religious teachers as Colani and Réville; and the hallowed names of Channing and of Parker remind us that the New World has been deeply stirred by this reviving breeze; so that on both sides of the Atlantic there is arising a friendly and united brotherhood of earnest and thoughtful men, who will not fail to heed and to proclaim the intimate relationship between the soul and the Eternal Mind. Assuredly there

are hopeful signs of a new daybreak for the world of thought, and therefore for the world of character and life. Philosophy and theology, too long estranged by mutual misunderstanding and engaged in unholy rivalry, are again, in a truer spirit than ever before, beginning to feel their blood relationship, to clasp each other's hands in token of love and firm alliance. Theologians in many quarters clearly discern that the evidences of their faith are not to be sought in signs and wonders external to the soul, but rest upon the divine and ever-present fact that the soul receives its life, its wisdom, its truest consolations and its purest joys, not chiefly from the phenomena of space and time, but from the felt presence of that personal God, whose spirit is perennially diffused, as the vital yet viewless air, in all holy affections and moral perceptions, and anon, when it listeth, speaks with articulate voice, at one time from out the cloudless sky of serene purity, at another from amid the vehement throes of passionate enthusiasm. Among philosophers, too, there is an increasing company who feel that, apart from the intuitions of the unseen world, philosophy is emptied of all meaning and all life, becomes a mental phantom which the reason cannot grasp, which the heart cannot sympathize with, and which is powerless to account for the most mighty and benign influences that have blessed and elevated society. So that the time is coming when the theologian, seeking for the grounds of faith in the experiences of the inner life, will be warmly interested in all the truths of philosophy, and the philosopher, following the light of intuition, will gladly cross the border-land and enter upon the sacred fields of theological research. Thus shall we regain, under new and more favourable conditions, that synthesis of reason and of faith which has ever characterized the true philosopher, which gives eternal interest to Plato's works, and has made the teachings of Descartes and Kant so satisfying and nourishing to all genuine seekers after truth.

We do not expect, however, the speedy realization of this hope. The Experience-philosophy (with which faith can never heartily ally itself) has still, it would seem, a long lease of life before it, and is too much in harmony with our secular tastes and tendencies not to have a numerous and perhaps increasing following. Yet we think that the acme

of its vigour is past. It seems to have told us most truths of consequence that it has to tell ; which truths indeed, the Intuitional philosophy is readily assimilating to its own structure. When the excitement of novelty is over, there would seem little in its doctrines to sustain a permanent and living attention in the minds of men ; and it may well be that it will gradually effect its own extinction by yielding fruits too insipid and unsubstantial to awaken any further desire to cultivate such unprofitable growths. We must admit, however, that there is another side to the picture ; and had we not strong confidence in the religious earnestness and moral principle of a large section of the middle and lower classes in this country, the extensive acceptance of the principles of this philosophy would call up serious alarm. We should fear lest these ideas, passing out of the hands of the cultured and amiable thinkers who now cherish them, and at the same time neutralize them by their high and pure characters, should filtrate through to the lower strata of society, and there carry on the mischievous work of disintegration, loosening the obligations of morality, dissipating the sanctities of religion, and liberating violent and evil passions to run on their reckless and destructive course. But the signs of the times among us are not such as accompanied the spread of Sensationalism in France at the close of the last century, nor is the English mind sensitive to the influence of abstract principles, or careful about the working out of logical results. Nevertheless, when we consider the wide-spread indifference to religion, and the markedly secular tone of our most popular literature, we cannot avoid anxiety ; and we earnestly pray that some God-sent enthusiasm may seize the hearts of Englishmen, and counteract that dull gravitation to the sensuous and the worldly, which is rendering us incapable of lofty sentiment and thought, and which, if it be not arrested, will so enfeeble our national character as to unfit us for all strong and healthful influence among the nations of the world.

CHARLES B. UPTON.

VII.—NOTICES OF BOOKS.

THERE is always matter for interest and reflection in the judgments of a cultivated layman on theological topics; and Mr. Strange's discussion of the question, "Is the Bible the Word of God?"* though contributing to its ultimate decision little or nothing that has not been said before, may command the attention of some by the freshness which pervades it and the peculiar point of view from which it starts. To his judicial aptitude Mr. Strange unites a knowledge of the educated Indian mind, and is incidentally able to throw much light on the failures which have hitherto attended every presentment of Christianity to the more intelligent Hindus. The book is cast in the form of conversations between a Candid Student (and he is very candid indeed) and a Reformed Pundit. The dialogues take up successively the subjects of the composition of the Old and New Testaments, miracles, prophecy, and the history of Jesus. The theological position of the Student is not very clear. He apparently accepts the doctrine of the Incarnation,† and generally gives the orthodox answers to the questions of the Pundit; though his candour frequently obliges him to confess himself unable to make any reply at all. There is, in fact, an occasional want of consistency both in the fundamental thought and in the treatment of special details. It is, for instance, somewhat surprising to find the Pundit saying, "I can see no more in this than that the miracles were to prove the doctrine, which doctrine might in itself be true or otherwise."‡ What common term is there between a miracle and a doctrine so that the one can prove the other? and how could a doctrine which is false be proved by a miracle? Again, in discussing the agony in Gethsemane, the Pundit says, "The prayer of such a person as Jesus, occupied on such a work as his, is to my mind inexplicable. He came on earth specially to die for sinners. What could he mean, then, by entreating God to let him escape this death?"§ The Gospels nowhere state that Jesus came to die for sinners; and it is unfair, we submit, to dis-

---

* The Bible; is it the Word of God? By Thomas Lumisden Strange, late a Judge of the High Court of Madras. London: Trübner. 1871.

† Pp. 273, 276. ‡ P. 69. § P. 339.

credit the narrative by testing it by conceptions which it does not contain, and which could not possibly arise until after the events which it professes to describe. In the same way the handling of the biblical books is not always consistent. Mr. Strange professes at the outset to take the Bible as he finds it, without qualifying any part of its communications by resort to critical limitations. But he makes use of the modern conclusions about the books of Isaiah and Daniel and the fourth Gospel; why, then, does he treat Deuteronomy as the work of Moses, and quote the utterances of the three prophets under the name of Zechariah indiscriminately as if they were all one? Perhaps the best part of the book is the discussion on the prophecies. The collation of the events of the career of Jesus to which prophecies are applied, with the original circumstances which occasioned them, is exceedingly well done; and the conclusion of the Student is no doubt just, that "if the prophecies of Jesus are to be dependent upon those relating to the Messiah in glory, then Jesus, as we have him, has not been prefigured in prophecy. And it is vain to claim for him the office of Messiah without shewing that he has executed the Messiah's appointed work. The non-renovation of the Jewish nation is a standing evidence that their Messiah has not yet appeared." We may remark, in passing, that our author has in one place weakened his argument by a curious misinterpretation. The phrase, "thy God reigneth" (Is. lii. 7), ought not certainly to be quoted in proof of the deity of the Messiah. It is one of the characteristics of the prophet of the captivity that he looks for the establishment of the pure theocracy without the intervention of any human king—a time when "JHVH God" himself shall come and rule; and the person whom he actually designates Messiah as the instrument of the deliverance of Israel (and therefore, indirectly, of the triumph of the theocracy) is not a son of David, or even of Abraham, at all, but is Cyrus the Persian king. The conversation on the history of Jesus appears to us the least satisfactory section of the book. The Student had already displayed a strange incapacity to understand the "sorrows" of Jesus,* and the extreme dryness of his tone prepared us to expect that the life of Christ would be treated without much sympathy. But we cannot comprehend our

* P. 266.

author's characterizing the language of Jesus to his mother on the cross as "cold and haughty;" and such remarks as these are surely uncalled for, not to say offensive: "Why did Jesus select three special witnesses of his sufferings, who were to witness nothing, but were to drop off to sleep repeatedly?"* or again: "The kiss of Judas seems to me just such a sensational incident as a person might throw in to give effect to a fictitious narrative."† No one certainly can read this book and continue to believe in the infallibility of the Bible; but if Mr. Strange has aimed at any further positive result, we do not think he has succeeded.

In his "Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews,"‡ Mr. M'Caul has accumulated a great deal of interesting illustration from Philo, the Targums, the Mishna and Gemara, and the later rabbinical writers. The book is one of laborious learning; it is a pity that the use which is made of it is not more worthy of the industry which it implies. The writer adopts all the received Messianic explanations, and generally brings abundant rabbinical citations in confirmation of them. The value of these citations, however, is very much diminished by the total absence of any attempt to estimate them critically and determine their approximate dates. Mr. M'Caul rightly says that it is impossible thoroughly to elucidate the writings of Jewish apostles without a knowledge of the Jewish habits of thought and the rabbinical formulas of interpretation. But we submit that a great deal more has to be done than merely to bring passages from the Talmud and set them by the side of passages from the New Testament. During the centuries of scholastic teaching which are represented in the Talmud, the fortunes of the Jewish nation most materially changed, and their interpretation of prophetic promise necessarily changed too. Moreover, the different systems within Judaism itself ought to be disentangled, and allowance be made for the possible interaction of Christian upon Jewish thought. All this, however, belongs to the higher criticism, for which Mr. M'Caul loses no opportunity of shewing his thorough contempt. Of course, not much is to be expected from a person who quotes "as indisputably true" the statement of Aristobulus that "Pythagoras, Plato and the Grecians

---

* P. 339. † P. 340.

‡ The Epistle to the Hebrews, in a Paraphrastic Commentary. By the Rev. Jos. B. M. M'Caul. London: Longmans. 1871.

had taken most of their philosophy from the Hebrew Scriptures." Bishop Colenso's book is characterized as "inconceivably silly," and Dean Stanley comes in for no mean share of castigation; and this, oddly enough, while Ewald is truly described as "one of the most colossal geniuses and illustrious scholars that theological Germany has ever produced;" but perhaps Mr. M'Caul has not fallen in with any other of his works than his Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, copious extracts from which adorn the pages of the book before us. It is, however, for Dean Alford that the most choice abuse is reserved. "Painful feebleness," "miserable blundering," "habitual carelessness," "childish nonsense," are not pleasant epithets; and we have a right to expect that a critic who makes free with such language will not expose himself to a reciprocation of it. A single specimen of Mr. M'Caul's style must suffice. He states in the Preface his conviction that the Epistle proceeds from St. Paul. There is no attempt to meet any of the weighty arguments which may be urged against this hypothesis; we are referred to the work itself, where we find vague allusions to similarity of style and manner, and such remarks as the following: "xiii. 18, 'Pray for us.' St. Paul makes the same request, Col. iv. 3, 1 Thess. v. 25, 2 Thess. iii. 1. Alford as usual, following Delitzsch, would include others as well as the writer in the plural expression, 'Pray for us.' He says, 'Here, as elsewhere, it is probably a mistake to suppose that the first person plural indicates the writer alone.' . . . Such an evasion of a testimony in favour of the Pauline authorship of this Epistle is more ingenious than candid or scholarly." But on ii. 3, "which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him," we read: "This admission that the Gospel had been in part received from second-hand, seems to militate in some degree against St. Paul's invariable claim to a direct and special revelation from Christ himself. In Gal. i. 11, 12, ii. 6, he expressly disclaims any human sources of information. In 1 Cor. xi. 23, he asserts that Christ himself communicated to him the sacramental formula. *The first person which the writer employs on the present occasion must not be too closely pressed. He probably speaks in the name of his readers.*" After this, our readers will probably have had enough and will not wish to hear even about the "admirable dexterity" of the Holy Ghost.

Mr. Sargent's "Compendium of Biblical Criticism"* would seem not unlikely to find purchasers, since the present bulky volume announces itself on the title-page as revised and enlarged. The added matter is so inserted as to give the maximum of trouble to the reader. In a book of upwards of 660 pages, we are surprised to come to the conclusion at p. 408, and then to find that the whole field of the canonical books is subsequently traversed twice over, first in the Supplement and then in the Addenda. No arrangement can possibly be worse than that which compels the reader to search in three different parts of the same volume for Mr. Sargent's opinion on any particular passage. And when it is found, we fear it is not much worth having. The author has doubtless expended much earnest care on his work; but he has absolutely no sense of the first duties of a critic. His mode of procedure is to go through each separate book, appending critical notes on the text, "to relieve it from embarrassments, to supply deficiencies, to discard interpolations, and to purge it from that extraneous corruption which has cleaved to it in the accumulation of ages." Had Mr. Sargent availed himself of the most recent researches in the task, the nature of which he has so fairly stated, the results might have been more successful; but Old Testament criticism seems to have been exhausted for him by the labours of Ussher and Kennicott, Horsley and Mant; while in the New Testament the authority of Bloomfield is generally considered as sufficient against that of Griesbach, Lachmann and Tischendorf, to say nothing of Alford or Tregelles. The writer does not attempt to lay down any principles for his own or for his readers' guidance; and it is only too plain that he is not aware that any are necessary. And when, from criticism of the text, our author wanders into the fields of interpretation, his want of any critical method is only rendered more conspicuous. What, for instance, is to be said of such a statement as the following, in a note on Joshua x. 13: "The expression of the heavenly luminaries becoming stationary, must be understood to be figurative, so far as respects the mode, circumstances and extent of its performance, but not in regard to the local reality of the events produced"? In a note on the text of

---

* A Compendium of Biblical Criticism on the Canonical Books of the Holy Scriptures. By Frederick Sargent. London: Longmans. 1871.

Judges v. 24, we find ourselves suddenly plunged into a tirade against Mariolatry and Cardinal Wiseman. On the expression in Jer. ii. 10, "the isles of Chittim," it is said, oddly enough, that "Italy and other European provinces are stated by Bochart to have been colonized by Chittim, the grandson of Japhet." With evident regret, Mr. Sargent gives up the text of the three heavenly witnesses, but says that "from the strength of its internal testimony and antithetical contrast with the earthly witnesses, it ought not to be peremptorily discarded, but may still be allowed to form a part either of the bracketed text, or in a marginal comment." After such a statement, it can surprise no one to find that Mr. Sargent remarks on 1 Tim. iii. 16: "Θεὸς. Griesbach, Lachmann and Tischendorf read ὅς, but the former important word *cannot be spared* from the text." In the same way, in Jude 4, he retains the word Θεόν, and translates, "denying the only Master, our God and Lord Jesus Christ." Numberless instances of the same total misapprehension of the critic's functions might be quickly collected from Mr. Sargent's pages. We regret to condemn so well-meaning a book as a total failure; but the recklessness of assertion which not unfrequently disfigures it, precludes our placing any confidence in statements in which we should be disposed to trust the author's painstaking research. Otherwise we should have said that the notes on various animals and plants were not without some value.

In a collection of singularly manly and outspoken papers on "Churches and their Creeds,"* the Rev. Sir Philip Perring treats of some of the topics arising out of the mutual relations of religious bodies in this country, and especially out of the position and pretensions of the Established Church. The author exhorts the Bishops to hold a congress for the purpose of bringing about a reconciliation of the Nonconformists with the Establishment; suggests that there should be more freedom of speech in the congregation, so as to secure the maximum of edification; denounces pew-rents and the offertory; urges more hearty co-operation between the clergy and their parishioners; proposes the nomination of several ministers for each parish; arrays an imposing series of objections against the Baptismal Service;

---

* Churches and their Creeds. By the Rev. Sir Philip Perring, Bart. London: Longmans. 1871.

gathers up the Scripture arguments against everlasting punishment, inclining somewhat curiously to find means of escape in the doctrine of the millennium; and then proceeds to a discussion of the Revision question, in which the Convocation of Canterbury is rather severely handled for "clerical presumption and arrogance." The writer's own specimens of revision do not altogether please us; and he cannot be said to be successful in his attempts to harmonize the Gospel accounts of the resurrection, the difference, for instance, between the Galilean tradition of Matthew and the Jerusalem tradition of Luke being wholly ignored. The book is by no means free from a somewhat rigid scripturalism; but its earnestness and independence are truly refreshing.

The Rev. T. A. Walker offers us a translation of four books (xi.—xiv.) of St. Augustine's treatise, "De Civitate Dei."* If, as appears to be the case, he entertains the hope that St. Augustine's discussion of the creation of the world in six days, or of the identity of nature in good and evil angels, will really contribute much to the solution of the momentous cosmic and psychological problems at present undetermined, we can only condole with him on his impending disappointment. The position which St. Augustine occupied for so many centuries as the dominant mind of the Latin Church, will always invest his great work with a peculiar historic interest; but it is impossible to expect that the difficulties of the nineteenth century can be settled by an "ipse dixit" from the fourth. Readers, however, who desire to become acquainted with the Bishop of Hippo's opinions on the origin of evil, the first and second death, flesh, soul and spirit, the Trinity and the Devil, will find Mr. Walker a sufficiently trustworthy guide. The obscurities of the great theologian's style render it difficult for any version to flow clearly, but the translator has evidently bestowed much pains on his task. A slip here and there is almost inevitable; but why should the argument on p. 13 be confused by the repetition of the clauses, "as they make concerning infinite spaces beyond the world," &c.? and why add even a single letter to a masterpiece, and designate the antagonist of Socrates, Georgias?

---

* The Origin of the Two Cities, Heavenly and Earthly; being Books xi. xii. xiii. xiv. of St. Augustine's Treatise, De Civitate Dei. Translated by Rev. T. A. Walker, M.A. London: Longmans. 1871.

Those who are familiar with the Life of Bunsen will doubtless recal his deep interest in the liturgies and hymns of various churches in which he desired to find those common elements of devotion which should harmonize all conflicting beliefs. Miss Catherine Winkworth has laid the English public under further obligations to her graceful pen, by selecting and translating a series of prayers from Baron Bunsen's ample collection.* The first part is intended for the family, and contains morning and evening prayers for three weeks, besides collects and prayers for special occasions throughout the year. The second part consists of prayers and meditations for private use. Some of them bear the name of St. Augustine, a few of St. Basil and St. Jerome, others are derived from the Greek Church; but the greater number are drawn from the writings of German divines, such as Albrecht, Böhme, Spener, Arnold, Tersteegen, since the Reformation. In some cases the prayers are addressed to Christ; but the majority, however, simply express those sentiments of thankfulness, contrition, trust and aspiration, which constitute the essence of religion. We greet with pleasure this fresh "witness to the real communion of saints in all ages and lands." J. E. C.

In the execution of his design to produce a complete work on Ecclesiastical History, Dr. De Pressensé gives, in the volume lately translated into English,† a sketch of the external relations of Christianity in the second and third centuries. The previous portions of the work were his "Life of Jesus Christ" and "Early Years of Christianity," and he promises a future volume on "Heresy and the Faith." In the description of the conflict between Christianity and Heathenism, the several persecutions are described with an unnecessary minuteness of detail, and narratives are given which the author himself evidently considers as in great part legendary. The notices of the Fathers are full and interesting; and the third book, "The Attack and Defence of Christianity in the Domain of Controversy," with its abstracts of the writings on both sides, well repays a careful perusal. The author is evidently desirous to view with

---

* Prayers from the Collection of the late Baron Bunsen. Selected and translated by Catherine Winkworth. London: Longmans. 1871.

† The Martyrs and Apologists. By E. De Pressensé, D.D. Translated by Annie Harwood. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1871.

candour and fairness the characters and writings of the assailants of his own religion, and to a large extent succeeds in doing so. The translation is satisfactory, and has had the advantage of passing under the supervision of the author. Ample references are given in every instance to the original sources whence the statements made have been derived, and the critical questions as to the authenticity of some of the writings attributed to early Fathers have not been overlooked.

Mr. Griffith* offers a valuable contribution towards the solution of those great problems which concern the highest interests of mankind, and which in the present day especially are agitating many minds. The second title of his work is the same as that of one published nearly twenty years ago by Mr. Miall; the earlier book, however, aimed at laying the basis for a belief in Christianity; the present one, with a wider scope, deals with absolute religion, and meets doubts and difficulties that apply to every form of theistic faith. The author starts at the right point when he begins with "Man," and makes our own consciousness of existence, personality and the possession of peculiar powers, the foundation of his philosophy. From this he endeavours to lead on to a belief in human immortality and in God. His argument on the former point is somewhat fanciful, and will probably appear far from conclusive to many minds. The section which treats of God's dealings with men, and traces His purpose for the development of the human race and the means by which He carries it out, is peculiarly interesting. The whole volume manifests extensive reading, great breadth of view, unusual candour, and much clearness of thought and power of logic. The abundance of biblical texts and allusions savours somewhat too strongly of the author's professional habits. But they are brought forward in no narrow spirit, and he also gives us plenty of apposite quotations from other writers. We can strongly recommend his work to readers of every class; whatever their theological position, however great or however small their previous knowledge of its topics, they will find here materials for thought, and meet with a mind that

---

* Fundamentals or Bases of Belief concerning Man, God, and the Correlation of God and Men. A Hand-book of Mental, Moral and Religious Philosophy. By Thomas Griffith, A.M., Prebendary of St. Paul's, Author of "The Spiritual Life," &c. London: Longmans. 1871.

is well trained without being prejudiced, and free without being void of convictions.

Two pamphlets invite a word of notice. The first, entitled "The Voysey Judgment,"* is a lecture by Mr. Wicksteed, delivered six months ago, but only now given to the public. Mr. Wicksteed's main position is, that while the Voysey Judgment could not have been other than it is, in the necessity under which the Church of England lies of appeal to her fixed standards, and with her incapacity of altering them by fresh legislation, Mr. Voysey is not to be adjudged guilty of dishonesty, but only of intellectual error, in remaining in the Church till he was turned out. The whole lecture breathes a generous and charitable spirit, and the author does not conceal his desire that the National Church should be widened to meet the whole complex wants of the nation. He is at one with the opinions expressed in a previous number of this Review, as to the duty of the Broad-church clergy to accept the consequences of the Voysey Judgment, and to quit a communion which solemnly repudiates their interpretation of the contract under which they fill their livings. The six months which have elapsed since he expressed the expectation with which his lecture concludes, will have shewn him that the Voysey Judgment makes no difference to any one but Mr. Voysey.—We have also to say something of a brochure by Mr. Carroll, called "The Collapse of the Faith, or the Deity of Christ as now taught by the Orthodox."† It consists of a *catena* of passages from various authors of reputed orthodoxy—Professor Dorner, the Bishop of Ossory, Mr. Gladstone, Professor Godet and others—with intent to shew that "the aspects here presented of Christ's divine nature certainly do not coincide with our current belief in that mystery, and, moreover, that they are wholly irreconcilable with the positive dogmatic statements of our Articles and Creeds." Mr. Carroll's conclusion seems to be one with which we have no difficulty in agreeing: "In sad and solemn truth, this dilemma seems to say that either our Formularies or the New Testament must be wrong." E.

---

* The Voysey Judgment: a Lecture, &c. With a Preface and Notes. By Rev. C. Wicksteed, B.A. London: Whitfield. 1871.

† The Collapse of the Faith, &c. Edited by Rev. W. G. Carroll, A.M., of St. Bride's, Dublin. T. Scott, Ramsgate.

VIII.—LETTER FROM THE BISHOP OF NATAL.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

Bishopstowe, Natal, July 3, 1871.

SIR,

As one of the liberal clergy of the Church of England to whom your words apply, in the remarks which you have made upon the Voysey Judgment in the April number of the Theological Review, you will allow me, I hope, to state the grounds on which I dissent from some of the conclusions to which you appear to have arrived as to the present status and future duty of such clergy in consequence of the delivery of that Judgment.

You say, "Hitherto it has been one of their characteristic principles that in the matter of articles and creeds and forms of prayer, 'the legal was the measure of the moral obligation'"—a principle "against which you have always strongly protested." But you seem to have altogether lost sight of the fact that this principle was asserted—by myself, at all events, and I believe by Mr. Wilson in his original enunciation of it—not as a guide for our own conduct, but as a limitation to the reproaches and assaults of our adversaries. Our own private sense of the "moral obligation" of the laws in question may be greater or it may be less than our sense of their "legal obligation." But what we assert is, that no one has a right to press against us as a "moral" delinquency any departure from those laws which does not transgress our "legal" obligations; no one has a right to charge us with "dishonesty," "heresy" or "schism," who cannot shew that we have violated the express letter and ascertained meaning of those laws.

But are we justly chargeable with moral delinquency if we do transgress these? You seem to think so, and to hold that we have no right to "appeal to the court of conscience from the Committee of Council," to "take refuge from an unfavourable legal definition in the formerly abandoned width of a moral obligation." I deny that we have ever "abandoned" that wider sense of our moral obligation, or ever thought of doing so. But do you mean to say that "in the court of conscience" we are bound to receive the recent Judgment, with all its frightful consequences, so well

pointed out in the article to which your own words are appended, as morally binding? Are you prepared to condemn Daniel, because when "he knew that the writing was signed" which made it death for him to pray to God, he, the prime minister of the kingdom, whose duty it was to maintain the law of the land in his own person, and to secure the punishment of all transgression of it by others, was "morally" bound either not to pray to God at all, or at least not "three times a day, as he did aforetime, his windows being open in his chamber towards Jerusalem"? I quote the case of Daniel, not, of course, as an historical fact, but because it will serve as a type of ten thousand instances in which the laws of our own and other lands in respect of religious matters have been in former days violated by dissenters of all classes, and no one supposes that they were guilty of any moral delinquency in so disobeying them. They took the consequences of their breach of the legal obligation, and often, as we all well know, very painful consequences.

But you will say, these were not men who had voluntarily put themselves under "legal obligations" as clergy of the Church of England. Were they not? Did Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer, then, resign their offices in the Church of England when Queen Mary came to the throne? Did they not—the two latter at all events—go on discharging the duties of their office, and witnessing for the truth of Christ as Protestant clergy, though the law and the powers that be were all against them, until they were seized, imprisoned, condemned and put to death? For persons, indeed, of liberal views, who are longing to enter the ministry, the recent Judgment must be a terrible stumbling-block. I have two sons now at college, whom I would joyfully see devote themselves to this sacred work, if their hearts inclined them to do it. But God forbid that I should seek to persuade either of them to put his neck into the slavish noose which this miserable Judgment has prepared for such young men, and consent to carry the heavy chains which it has forged for the clergy of the Church of England, such as neither we nor our fathers have been compelled to wear.

But how are *we* "morally" bound by this Judgment? I entirely agree with you that "tests should be wholly abolished or, if maintained, should be honestly complied with."

But you have no right to insist that we shall be "morally" bound by a retrospective ordinance of this kind. We signed the tests in good faith, according to the sense of the age in which we signed them, when no such stringent adherence to their literal meaning was insisted on as now. By recent decisions the Privy Council has widened materially the circle of our "legal obligations," and in so doing has undoubtedly expressed the spirit of the age in which we live. And accordingly, still more recently, the Legislature has relaxed them still further, by express enactment, requiring a person when ordained to declare only that he "assents to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, and to the Book of Common Prayer, and of the Ordering of Bishops, Priests and Deacons," and that he "believes the Doctrine of the Church of England as therein set forth to be agreeable to the Word of God;" and Mr. Buxton in the House of Commons, when this law was passed, expressly pointed out, in the name of the Committee who framed it, that the expression, "the Doctrine," was purposely used—not "the Doctrines"—in order to make it more general, and not to bind the conscience of the candidate for ordination to the maintenance of each individual doctrine therein set forth. With this plain intimation of the will of the Legislature, by which alone (as we hold) our National Church is governed, are we to consider ourselves "morally" bound by this retrograde Judgment, which has raked up the theology of three centuries ago, and has "added to our yoke" and "made our burden yet more grievous," and, "whereas our fathers were chastised with whips, has chastised us with scorpions"?

I hold that if we suffer ourselves to be turned out of the paths of duty, in which we had set ourselves *before* the delivery of this Judgment, one hair's breadth for fear of any consequences that may follow from our present newly-fashioned "legal obligations," we shall be "morally" guilty, however we may escape the legal penalties, and that our course is to go steadily forward, as servants of the Truth, "fearing no evil, for God is with us," and prepared for all possible results.

Yours faithfully,

J. W. Natal.

INDEX TO VOL. VIII.

Abbott, T. K., "The English Bible, and our Duty with regard to it," noticed, 437.
"Apostolical Succession not a Doctrine of the Church of England," noticed, 443.
ARNOLD ON ST. PAUL, 521. General tone of the reviews of Mr. Arnold's book, 521. St. Paul's idea of God and that of modern science, 523. Mr. Arnold's definition of God, 523. Paul and Calvinism, 526. His conception of the relation between God and man, 528. Doctrine of Justification, 530. Paul's use of the story of Adam's fall, 532. His idea of faith, 533. Paul both mystical and practical, 534. Paul or Christ? 536. Resurrection from the dead, 537. Paul's view of Christ's resurrection, 538. Personalities of Mr. Arnold's book, 541. His historical view of Puritanism, 542. Presbyterian churches left free have become Unitarian, 542. Relation of the theology of the future with the theology of Paul, 544.
Arnold, Matthew, D.C.L., LL.D, "St. Paul and Protestantism," reviewed, 521.

Bartley, G. C. T., "The Schools for the People," noticed, 439.
BEARD, CHARLES, B.A., author of articles, "The Separation of Church and State," 72. "The Voysey Judgment," 231. Notices of books, 417, 423.
BEARD, J. R., D.D., author of article, "The French Theophilanthropists," 318.
"Book, the, of Prayer and Praise," noticed, 283.
Boultbee, T. P., M.A., "An Introduction to the Theology of the Church of England," noticed, 437.
Bowes, John, "The New Testament, translated," noticed, 282.
Brooke, Stopford A., "Freedom in the Church of England," noticed, 417.
Brown, J. Baldwin, "First Principles of Ecclesiastical Truth," noticed, 285.
"Misread Passages of Scripture, Second Series," noticed, 288.
Bunsen, Baron, "Prayers," edited by Miss Winkworth, noticed, 579.

Caird, Dr., "What is Religion?" noticed, 289.
CALL, W. M. W., M.A., author of article, "The Nero-Saga," 291.
Capes, J. M., article in Contemporary Review, "The Yoke of the Articles and Prayer Book," noticed, 417.
Carroll, W. S., M.A., "Sermons preached in St. Bride's Church, Dublin," noticed, 442. "The Collapse of the Faith," noticed, 584.
CHURCH, THE SPIRITUAL UNITY OF THE, 154. New interest in the subject, 154. True bond, spiritual and moral, 155. Bond between orthodox believers and those who, rejecting the supernatural, accept the spirit of Christ, 156. The latter to be recognized as disciples, 157. Common faith and hope in God, 158. Faith in human brotherhood, 160. In immortality, 161. Bond between orthodox believers and those who accept in Christ a revelation from God, 163. Practical good to be expected from the recognition of this union, 165.
COBBE, FRANCES POWER, author of article, "Darwinism in Morals," 167.
Cobbe, F. P., "Alone to the Alone: Prayers for Theists," noticed, 432.
Coleridge, Sir J. T., "Letter to Canon Liddon," noticed, 443.
Collett, S. D., "Keshub Chunder Sen's English Visit," noticed, 441.
Conway, M. C., "The Earthward Pilgrimage," noticed, 277.

Creeds : their Use in Worship, 237. View of the Prayer Book by the earlier Anglicans, 237. Reaction in favour of the Communion, 239. Creeds an obstacle to unity in worship, 240. Assumptions from which the paper starts, 241. Views of prayer, 242. History of the Creeds, 244. The Athanasian Creed, 246. The Nicene Creed, 249. The Apostles' Creed, 253. Those who use the Apostles' Creed not agreed as to the meaning of its clauses, 256. Worship needs no creeds, 264.

Crosskey, H. W., author of article, "The Early History of Mankind," 111. Notices of books," 432.

Crowfoot, J. R., "Fragmenta Evangelica," &c., noticed, 268.

Cuneiform, the, Inscriptions in Relation to Biblical History, 495. History of hieroglyphical discovery, 496. Discovery of the key to the cuneiform inscriptions, 497. Beginning of interpretation, 497. Work of Grotefend, 498. Carried on by others, 499. Discoveries of Botta and Layard, 500. Relation of these inscriptions to Genesis x., 502. Early history of the Chaldees, 503. Mention of them by Isaiah, 504. Tribute of Jehu to Shalmaneser, 505. Hazael of Damascus, 506. Sargon and Sennacherib, 508. Destruction of Sennacherib's army, 509. Nebuchadnezzar, 510. Persian inscriptions, 511.

Dale, R. W., "The Jewish Temple and the Christian Church," noticed, 288. "The Ten Commandments," noticed, 438.

Darwin, Charles, M.A., "The Descent of Man," reviewed, 167.

Darwinism in Morals, 167. God hidden by the machinery of His will, 167. No objection to the theory of the descent of man on religious grounds, 168. Intense interest of Mr. Darwin's book, 169. His doctrine of the origin of the moral sense, 170. Older and newer utilitarianism, 171. The latter almost on intuitional ground, 172. Origin of conscience ; theory started by Spencer, elaborated by Darwin, 173. Moral sense developed out of social instincts aided by habit, 174. Danger of the doctrine, 175. Criticism of it, 177. Mr. Darwin's doctrine of repentance, 181. Does not account for remorse, 184. Difference between regret and repentance, 186. His doctrine of the mutability of the moral sense, 188.

Davidson, S., D.D., author of article, "The Relation of the New Testament Messiah to his Jewish Prototype," III., 1 ; IV., 342.

Doubleday, T., "Matter for Materialists," noticed, 271.

Drummond, James, B.A., author of article, "The Reading, 'The Only-begotten God,' John i. 18," 468.

"Echoes of Holy Thoughts," noticed, 283.

Evans, G. D., "One Thousand Gems from H. Ward Beecher," noticed, 287.

"Examination of Liddon's Bampton Lectures on the Divinity of Christ," by a Clergyman, noticed, 414.

Experience-Philosophy, the, and Religious Belief, 547. Philosophy of the 18th century favourable to Deistic belief ; not so its descendant of this century, 548. Mr. J. S. Mill on the belief in God, 549. Is the argument from Design open to him ? 550. Consciousness of personal will the way to God, 552. Relation of this idea to discoveries of science, 553. Qualifications for the discovery and imparting of theological truth, 555. Locke's conception of the sources of religious knowledge, 557. Cousin's criticism, 558. Locke's doctrine of revelation, 559. Emerson on revelation, 563. Locke's happy inconsistency, 564. Effects of the separation between philosophy and theology, 567. Growth of a healthier view, 569. Conclusion, 570.

Fawcett, H., M.P., "Pauperism, its Causes and Remedies," reviewed, 444.

Gill, J., "Notices of the Jews by the Classic Writers of Antiquity," noticed, 284.

Gillespie, W. H., "The Argument à priori for the Being and Attributes of the Absolute One," noticed, 269.

Girdlestone, C., "Christendom, sketched from History in the Light of Holy Scripture," noticed, 287.
Godet on the Synoptical Gospels, 512. General character of the book, 512. Value it attaches to the third Gospel, 513. Different theories of the origin of the Synoptical Gospels, 514. Godet's own view, 515. Criticism thereof, 517.
Godet, F., "Commentaire sur l'Evangile de Saint Luc," reviewed, 512.
Godwin, J. H., "Epistle to the Galatians, translated," noticed, 435.
Goodsir, J. T., "Seven Homilies on Ethnic Inspiration," noticed, 270.
Gordon, John, author of article, "John Wesley," I., 193; II., 374.
"Gospel, the Oldest," noticed, 288.
Gray, J. C., "Bible Lore," noticed, 436.
Griffith, T., "Fundamentals or Bases of Belief," noticed, 580.

Hampden, Bishop, 360. His life an instance of arrested growth, 360. Liberal elements of thought in the Oxford of his youth, 361. Hampden and the scholastic philosophy, 362. Position in the debate between theology and religion, 364. Miss Hampden's theory of the opposition to her father, 366. His later phases of thought, 368. Hampden as a Bishop, 371. His conduct in the Colenso controversy, 372. Conclusion, 373.
Hampden, Henrietta, "Some Memorials of R. D. Hampden, Bishop of Hereford," reviewed, 360.
Haug, Martin, Ph.D., "Essay on the Pahlavi Language," reviewed, 96.
Helfenstein, James, Ph.D., "Comparative Grammar of the Teutonic Languages," noticed, 429.
Hill, A. H., author of article, "Pauperism, its Causes and Remedies," 445.
Hutton, R. H., "Essays, Theological and Literary," noticed, 273.

Jacox, F., "Secular Annotations on Scripture Texts," noticed, 282.
James, W., "Memoir of Rev. T. Madge," noticed, 423.
J. E. C., author of notices of books, 572.
Jerusalem, the Recovery of, 407. Unsatisfactory character of the book, 407. Capt. Warren and his work, 408. Little result, 409. Capt. Wilson on the Sea of Galilee, 411. Anderson on the survey of Palestine, 412. The Moabite Stone, 413.
Jones, T., "The Work of the Christian Preacher," noticed, 444.

K., author of article, "The Cuneiform Inscriptions in Relation to Biblical History," 495.
Kenny, Courtney, author of article, "The Voysey Judgment," 221.

Lamport, W. J., author of article, "The Parsees," 96. Notice of books, 429.
Latham, J. H., "Theories of Philosophy and Religion," &c., noticed, 272.
Locke, John, "The Philosophical Works of," reviewed, 547.
Lubbock, Sir John, "The Origin of Civilization and the Primitive Condition of Man," reviewed, 111.

Mackay, R. W., M.A., author of article, "On Mechanism, Religious and Educational," 131.
Major, J. R., D.D., "The Gospel of St. Mark," noticed, 288.
Mankind, the Early History of, 111. Opposite poles of thought from which theologians and men of science start, 111. Have men risen or fallen? 112. The true theory the most religious, 113. Mr. Tylor's researches, 114. Lubbock's classification of religions, 117. Is religion general to the race? 118. Fetichism, 121. Animal worship, 123. Idolatry, 124. No evidence of an original state of perfection from which men have fallen, 129.
Mann, Leigh, author of article, "The Spiritual Unity of the Church," 154.
Martineau, R., M.A., author of article, "The Revision of the Authorized Version of the Old Testament," 53. Notices of books, 266.

M'Caul, J. B. M., "The Epistle to the Hebrews in a Paraphrastic Commentary," noticed, 574.

Mechanism, Religious and Educational, 131. Mr. Huxley's wish to be a clock, 131. Mechanical study of the Scriptures, 132. Professor Charteris on Baur, 133. The first disciples, 134. After Christ's death, 135. Paul, 136. Divergence of the spiritual and mechanical forms of Christianity, 138. Difference between Paul and the Twelve, 139. Attack upon Paul in the Apocalypse, 141. Clementine Homilies, 142. Simon Magus, 143. Pauline character of the third Gospel and the Acts, 147. The finished compromise in the Pastoral letters, 148. The Reformation, 150. Mechanical tendencies of modern science, 152.

Messiah, the New Testament: his Relation to his Jewish Prototype, III., 1. Is the sense of Scripture one or twofold? 1. Meaning of accommodation, 3. Observations and questions as to this principle, 5. Classification of quotations, 7. From Matthew, 7—14. From Mark, 15. From Luke, 15. From John, 16. Pauline quotations, 18—28. Petrine quotations, 29.

Messiah, the New Testament: his Relation to his Jewish Prototype, IV., 342. Quotations in Hebrews, 342. General application of Old Testament passages by New Testament writers, 346. Double sense in prophecy, 347. Accommodation proper, 349. Prophetic Messiah does not correspond to the Jesus of the Gospels, 351. Is Christianity founded on Judaism? 352. No definite foretelling of future events in the Old Testament, 359.

Meyer, Leo, "Die Gothische Sprache," noticed, 429.

Mill, James, "Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind," reviewed, 547.

Natal, Bishop of, Letter from, 582.

Nero-Saga, the, 291. Stories of return of Harold and Arthur, 291. Other similar legends, 292. Reports of the survival of Nero, 294—in the Sibylline Oracles, 296. In other books, 299. Presence of this belief in the Apocalypse, 303. Interpretation of the Apocalypse on this theory, 304. The mark of the Beast, 310. Origin of the Nero-Saga, 312. Of Eastern derivation, 313. Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, 314. Appearance of Christ and end of the world, 315. Dies Iræ, 316. The Sibyls of the Sistine Chapel, 317.

O'Connor, W. A., B.A., "Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans," noticed, 434.

Parker, J., D.D., "Ad Clerum: Advice to a Young Preacher," noticed, 286.

Parsees, the, 96. Early History, 97. Anquetil du Perron, 98. Studies in India, 99. Publication of his work, 100. Its reception, 101. Rask, 101. The Zend language, 102. Pehlevi, 103. Origin of the language, 104. Its peculiarities, 105. Ignorance of the Parsee priesthood, 105. Outline of Parsee doctrine, 106. The Parsees in Bombay, 108. Guebres of Eastern Persia, 109. The Yezidis, 110.

Paul, C. Kegan, M.A., author of articles, "On the Use of Creeds in Worship," 237. "The Recovery of Jerusalem," 407. "Arnold on St. Paul," 521.

Pauperism, its Causes and Remedies, 444. Popular ignorance the chief cause, 446. The old Poor-law, 447. The new law, 447. Pauperism in America and the Colonies, 448. Maladministration of the present law, 449. Improvidence of the poor, 450. Stagnation of labour, 451. Desertion of children, 453. Reckless increase of population, 453. Dwellings of the poor, 455. Charity organization, 456. Boarding-out system, 458. Remedies: national education, 459. Emigration, 460. Co-operative industry, 461. cultivation of waste lands, 463. Game-laws, 464. Enclosure of commons, 465. Conclusion, 467.

Perring, Sir Philip, "Churches and their Creeds," noticed, 577.
Pressensé, E. de, "The Martyrs and Apologists," noticed, 579.

Rawlinson, George, M.A., "Bampton Lectures, 1859;" "Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World;" "Alleged Historical Difficulties of the Old and New Testaments," reviewed, 495.
Reading, the, "The Only-begotten God," John i. 18, 468. Present interest of the subject, 469. Evidence of MSS., 470. Of versions, 472. Of quotations in the Fathers, 474. Ignatius and Irenæus, 475. Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria, 477. Origen, 478. Hippolytus, 479. Eusebius, 480. Athanasius, 482. Didymus, 483. Basil, 485. Epiphanius, 486. Hilary, 488. Gregory of Nyssa and Cyril, 490. Chrysostom, 492. Summary, 493. Internal evidence, 494.
"Reasons for Returning to the Church of England," noticed, 417.
"Recovery of Jerusalem, the," reviewed, 407.
Reville, Albert, "Histoire du Diable," reviewed, 30. English Translation, noticed, 287.
Revision of the Authorized Version of the Old Testament, 53. Ought the Authorized Version of the Old Testament to be corrected or superseded? 53. Progress of Hebrew learning; Renan's opinion, 53. School of the Buxtorfs, 56. Development of Hebrew syntax, 57. Massoretic punctuation, 59. Defective knowledge of syntax to be noticed in the Authorized Version, 59. Examples, 60, 61. Use of the article, 62. Names of God, 64. Correction of the Massoretic punctuation necessary, 65. Examples of revised translation, 68.
Roskoff, G., "History of the Devil," reviewed, 30.
Roskoff's History of the Devil, 30. "Eigentliche Teufelsperiode," 31. Early dualism, 32. Madagascan prayer, 32. Roskoff's explanation too exclusively natural, 33. Hebrew dualism, 34. The Devil of the New Testament, 36. Of the three first centuries, 37. Shortcomings of the book, 38. Sermon of St. Eligius, 40. Diabolic belief in the 13th and following centuries, 42. Supposed worship of the Devil, 43. His contests with the saints, 44. Multiplication of devils, 45. Trials for witchcraft, 46. Relation of witchcraft to the cultus of saints, 49. Idea underlying the conception of a personal Devil, 52.

Sargent, F., "A Compendium of Biblical Criticism," noticed, 576.
Separation, the, of Church and State, 72. Hopeful and peaceful spirit of Dean Stanley's book, 73. Mr. Shipley's account of things in the Church, 74. State of Evangelical feeling, 75. Storms of the last twenty years, 76. The Catholic party, 77. Attractiveness of Sacramental theology, 79. Demand of the Catholic party for self-government, 79. The Evangelicals, 81. Men of no party, 83. Want of definite policy in Governments, 84. Distribution of Church patronage by the State, 85. Bishops, 85. Report of Ritual Commission, 86. Disestablishment the probable way out of the difficulty, 88. The position of the Broad Church, 89. Heresy in the Church is ceasing to be critical and becoming doctrinal, 90. The Church to be widened, 91. Contrast between the principles of Authority and Liberty, 93. The freedom of the Church, 95. A truer freedom, 96.
Shipley, Orby, M.A., "The Four Cardinal Virtues," &c., reviewed, 72. "Secular Judgments in Spiritual Matters," noticed, 443.
Smith, G. V., Ph.D., "The Bible and Popular Theology," noticed, 414.
Stanley, A. P., D.D., "Essays on Church and State from 1850 to 1870," reviewed, 72. Letter to a Friend in Guardian Newspaper, noticed, 417.
Strange, T. L., "The Bible; is it the Word of God?" noticed, 572.
Stroud, W., "The Physical Cause of the Death of Christ," noticed, 284.

Tylor, E. B., "Researches into the Early History of Mankind and the Development of Civilization," reviewed, 111.
Theophilanthropists, the French, 318. Establishment of their worship, 318. Origin of the sect, 319. Exposition of their scheme, 320. Lay origin of the sect, 322. Literary productions, 324. Public worship, 325. Festivals, 327. Rites and ceremonies, 328. Fundamental beliefs, 331. Decay and extinction, 333. Hauy, 334. Siauve, 335. Dupont de Nemours, 335. Saint Pierre, 336. Lépeaux, 337. Conclusion, 340.
Tyerman, L., "Life of Wesley," reviewed, 193, 374.

Upton, C. B., B.A., B.Sc., author of article, "The Experience-Philosophy and Religious Belief," 547. Of notice, "Some Philosophical Books," 269. Notices of books, 414.
Urlin, R. D., "John Wesley's Place in Church History determined," &c., reviewed, 193, 374.

Van Oosterzee, J. J., "The Theology of the New Testament," noticed, 280.
Voysey Judgment, the, 221. Judgment coldly received, 221. Mr. Voysey's line of defence, 222. Passages of the Judgment referring to the Atonement, 222—to the theory of human nature, 223. Trinity and person of Christ, 225. Scriptures, 226. This Judgment limits that in the case of Essays and Reviews, 227. General results, 230. Mr. Beard's remarks on the Judgment, 231. Broad-church party ignore the Judgment, 232. Its effect on their leading principles, 233. The Purchas case, 234. Possible results of the Bennett case, 235. Hope for freedom, 236.

Walker, T. A., "The Origin of the Two Cities, translated from Augustine's 'De Civitate Dei,'" noticed, 578.
Wedgewood, Julia, "John Wesley and the Evangelical Reaction of the Eighteenth Century," reviewed, 193, 374.
Wesley, John, I., 193. Puritanism, 194. Act of Uniformity, 195. The "Religious Societies," 196. Samuel Wesley and his wife, 197. Early life of Wesley, 200. At Oxford, 200. Charles Wesley and the first Methodist society, 201. Religious devotedness, 202. Personal appearance and manners, 204. Goes to Georgia, 205. So-called conversion, 207. Relation to the Established Church, 209. Assumption of authority, 210. Field preaching, 211. Separation from W. Law, 212. From the Moravians, 213. Difference with Whitfield, 215. Beginning of systematic Methodism, 217.
Wesley, John, II., 374. His industry, 375. His preaching, 376. Serenity of mind, 378. Habits of the later period of his life, 379. Disinterestedness, 380. Death of his mother, 381. Opposition to Methodism, 382. First Conference, 383. His preachers, 384. His relation to his preachers, 385. Circuits, 386. Methodist character, 387. The Hymn-book, 388. Wesley's marriage, 389. Striking features of his character, 390. Separation of Methodism from Calvinistic associations, 395. Practical element in his teaching, 397. Secret of his power spiritual, 400. Standard of doctrine, 401. His relation to the Established Church, 402. Last years, 405. Death, 406.
Wicksteed, P. H., M.A., author of article, "Roskoff's History of the Devil," 30.
Wicksteed, C., B.A., "The Voysey Judgment," noticed, 584.
Wilkins, A. S., author of note to article, "The Mythology of the Aryan Nations," 130.
Williams, Dr. Rowland, "Hebrew Prophets," Vol. II., noticed, 266.
Wright, John, B.A., author of article, "Godet on the Synoptical Gospels," 512.

Zeller, E., "Theologische Jahrbücher," reviewed, 291.

26817

GTU Library
3 2400 00684 3605

THREE DAY
CIRCULATION

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500

All items are subject to recall